FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-95-209
Monday
30 October 1995

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-95-209 CONTENTS *30 October 1995*

NOTICE: This volume contains a representative selection of material previously disseminated in softcopy format.

BULGARIA

- 'Duality' of Zhelev, Videnov Balkan Policy Viewed *[24 CHASA 26 Oct]* 1
- EU Statement on Restarting Kozloduy Reactor Unit *[Sofia conference handout]* 1
  - Gechev: EU Accepts Our Stance *[PARI 26 Oct]* 2
- Polling Institutes: Socialists Score 'Easy' Win *[AFP]* 2
  - Seven SDS Mayors Elected *[Sofia Radio]* 3

CZECH REPUBLIC

- Havel Calls For Quick Decision by West on NATO *[Berlin DDP/ADN]* 4
- Havel on EU, NATO, Trip to Germany *[Berlin DDP/ADN]* 4
  - On NATO, Mideast Peace Process *[Prague Radio]* 4
- Government To Be Inoculated After Dlouhy Illness *[PRAVO 25 Oct]* 5

SLOVAKIA

- Daily Questions Clinton's Praise of Kovac *[HOSPODARSKE NOVINY 24 Oct]* 6
- Commentary Notes Clinton's Avoidance of Meciar *[SME 25 Oct]* 6
- Article Queries Report on U.S. Envoy's Statement *[NARODNA OBRODA 26 Oct]* 6
  - Meciar Reacts to Comments on Democracy *[Bratislava Radio]* 7
- Comment: Kovac Kidnapping Work of Opposition *[SLOVENSKA REPUBLIKA 26 Oct]* 10
- Defense Official Urges President Kovac To Resign *[SLOVENSKA REPUBLIKA 25 Oct]* 10
- Journalists Protest EU Anti-Slovak 'Hysteria' *[Bratislava Radio]* 11
- Comment on New Hungarian Party, HZDS Links *[SME 24 Oct]* 11

HUNGARY

- New Forces Replace Guards on Southern Border *[Budapest Radio]* 13
- MSZP Deputies Support Stabilization Program *[Budapest Radio]* 13
- Paks Nuclear Station Workers Hold Warning Strike *[Budapest Radio]* 13
  - 'Further Strikes' Anticipated *[Budapest Radio]* 13

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

- Izetbegovic Heads Delegation to Ohio Talks *[Sarajevo Radio]* 14
  - 'Good Chance' of United State *[AFP]* 14
  - Emphasizes Undivided Bosnia *[Sarajevo Radio]* 14
- U.S., Russia Closer to Agreement on Peace Force *[TANJUG]* 15
- Federation VP Ganic Interviewed on Peace Process *[Zagreb TV]* 15
- Silajdzic Rejects Serb Demand To Return Areas *[Sarajevo Radio]* 18
- Opposition Parties Comment on Negotiating Platform *[Editorial Report]* 18
- Intellectuals Contemplate Swiss-Type Organization *[Sarajevo Radio]* 19
- Serb Republic Objectives in Peace Talks Outlined 19
  - Karadzic Interviewed on Peace Process *[Banja Luka TV]* 19
  - Karadzic Outlines Objectives *[Banja Luka TV]* 32
  - Assembly Head 'Optimistic' *[Banja Luka TV]* 32
  - Peace Never Closer *[SRNA]* 32

  - Hoping for 'Compromise' *[AFP]* ... 33
- Serb Patriotic Front Disputes RS Prime Minister *[BORBA 26 Oct]* ... 33
- Izetbegovic Favors Expansion of Ties With Iran *[Tehran IRNA]* ... 34

CROATIA

- Tudjman, HDZ Renew Manate in 29 Oct Elections ... 35
  - Elections 'Generally Free and Fair' *[AFP]* ... 35
  - Tudjman Welcomes 'Convincing Victory' *[Zagreb Radio]* ... 35
  - 'No Significant Difficulties' *[Zagreb Radio]* ... 36
  - Compliance With Electoral Law *[Zagreb Radio]* ... 36
  - Tudjman Remark Causes Uproar *[AFP]* ... 36
- Tudjman Addresses HDZ Rally in Zagreb 27 Oct *[Zagreb TV]* ... 37
- Croatian Serbs Vote on 'Separate Ballot Paper' *[TANJUG]* ... 38
  - Authorities Accused of Interference *[AFP]* ... 38
- Opposition Leader Warns of 'European Paraguay' *[Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG 28 Oct]* ... 39
- Special Election Lists 'Cause Suspicion' *[GLOBUS 27 Oct]* ... 39
- Tudjman Pledges To Free Eastern Slavonia ... 41
  - 'Let Us Be Patient' *[AFP]* ... 41
  - 'Action Before Christmas' if Talks Fail *[Zagreb Radio]* ... 42
- Tudjman Tells Army Officers To Maintain Readiness *[Zagreb Radio]* ... 42
- Serbs Cancel Planned 28 Oct Talks on E. Slavonia *[AFP]* ... 42
  - Reject 'Speedy Reintegration' *[Belgrade Radio]* ... 43
  - International Mediators Pro-Croatian *[SRNA]* ... 43
- Serb Leader Assails Croat Moves on E. Slavonia *[SRNA]* ... 44
- Serb Slavonia Commander Expects Denouement *[Vecernje Novosti 27 Oct]* ... 44
- Official Criticizes Comments by U.S. Congressman *[Zagreb TV]* ... 45

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

- Foreign Ministry Views Relations With Australia *[MIC]* ... 46
- Background to Frckovski Resignation Analyzed *[PULS 27 Oct]* ... 46
- Assembly Adopts Law on Local Self-Management *[MIC]* ... 48
  - Justice Minister Praises Law *[MIC]* ... 48
- France Opens Honorary Consulate in Bitola *[MIC]* ... 48

POLAND

- Two Candidates Withdraw From Presidential Race ... 50
  - Tadeusz Zielinski *[Warsaw Radio]* ... 50
  - Marek Markiewicz *[Warsaw TV]* ... 50
- New Polls on Presidential Election Released ... 50
  - CBOS Poll *[ZYCIE WARSZAWY 27 Oct]* ... 50
  - OBOP Poll *[Warsaw TV]* ... 50
- ZChN 'Still Supporting' Waltz Candidacy *[Warsaw Radio]* ... 51
  - Official Backing Not Withdrawn *[Warsaw Radio]* ... 51
  - Voters Urged to Support Walesa *[Warsaw TV]* ... 51
- Walesa Interviewed on Election Issues *[Warsaw TV]* ... 51
- Daily Views Walesa's Changing Image *[GAZETA WYBORCZA 27 Oct]* ... 56
- Walesa Accused of Ties to SB, Embezzlement *[TRYBUNA 27 Oct]* ... 57
- Growing Support for Walesa Assessed *[RZECZPOSPOLITA 26 Oct]* ... 58
- Kwasniewski on Political Beliefs, Campaign *[Warsaw Radio]* ... 61
- Walesa Might Mount 'Barricade' If Kwasniewski Wins *[Warsaw Radio]* ... 62
- Duma Official Wants Delay in NATO Membership *[GAZETA WYBORCZA 27 Oct]* ... 62
- Oleksey, Duma Member Discuss Ties, European Issues *[PAP]* ... 63

Cabinet Adopts 1996 Budget; Oleksy Comments *[Warsaw Radio]* 63
  Military To Get More Money *[Warsaw Radio]* 64
Defense Minister on Media Coverage of Army *[POLSKA ZBROJNA 25 Oct]* 64

SLOVENIA

Official Denies Sea, Land Corridors Linked *[Ljubljana Radio]* 67
  Kucan Clarifies Statements on Croatian Corridor *[Ljubljana Radio]* 67
Italy To Suspend Talks Over Thaler's Statements *[MAG 25 Oct]* 67
Parliament Debates Annulment of Citizenships *[Ljubljana Radio]* 68

YUGOSLAVIA

Federal

Government Endorses Strategy for Peace Talks *[Belgrade Radio]* 69
Status of International Forces in Bosnia Viewed *[TANJUG]* 69

Montenegro

Bulatovic Comments on Peace Talks in U.S. *[Belgrade Radio]* 70

'Duality' of Zhelev, Videnov Balkan Policy Viewed

AU3010111295 Sofia 24 CHASA in Bulgarian 26 Oct 95 p 10

[Article by Rosen Yankov: "Zhelev, Videnov Solve Puzzle"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Bulgaria is not a state but a crossroad puzzle, in which President Zhelyu Zhelev solves the horizontal clues, while Prime Minister Zhan Videnov—the vertical. Last week it was the turn of the president and he asserted the East-West Balkan transportation corridor.

Linking the Durres Port on the Adriatic with Burgas on the Black Sea with highways, railroad lines, and electric power supply cables, is Zhelev's personal initiative. The president has discussed this project over the last two years, persuaded the interested sides, and sought the related political and financial support. Now that Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia [The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—FYROM] and Turkey have signed the agreement, the corridor is no longer an intention but a fact.

Zhelyu Zhelev developed his entire infrastructure activity under the government's nose and without informing the government of it. As Deputy Foreign Minister Konstantin Glavanakov admitted, the Foreign Ministry does not even have the text of the declaration. They have only been briefed in general terms.

For Pirinski, and especially Videnov, this presidential solo activity is like a powerful blow to their self-esteem. The government is outraged, because now it will have to implement a decision adopted by someone else. Nevertheless, Videnov has a choice—he could block the actual construction in the Bulgarian section of the corridor by depriving it of financial support through the budget. In such a case the presidential initiative will remain a piece of paper, and there are already examples of this.

However, Videnov could balance Zhelev's successes with a success of his own, by making a breakthrough in the north-south direction. He controls negotiations with the Romanians on building a second bridge across the Danube, and the talks with the Greeks on the trans-Balkan highway. Thus the new political map of the Balkans will be crisscrossed by highways that also mask the axes of political influence. One of them is already emerging—this is the Tirana-Skopje-Zhelev-Ankara axis. The other axis is also clear—this is the Athens-Videnov-Bucharest-Moscow axis.

A fleeting glance at the globe proves that in all his trips and meetings abroad during the last year, Videnov is following the logic of the vertical contacts, while for his part, Zhelev is implementing horizontal contacts. One climbs along the meridians, the other walks along the parallels. The question is whether it is not high time to coordinate Bulgaria's foreign policy? Perhaps, the opposite is true, namely, the existence of many foreign policies is beneficial for Bulgaria.

According to the government, this duality in foreign policy is true insanity, which sets us apart from the normal states. However, according to the president it would be wonderful if the two axes—East-West and North-South—were to cross on Bulgarian territory. One could ponder much those two theses and also think about a way to combine them. It is an obvious fact that Videnov cannot duplicate Zhelev's successes, and vice versa. Each of them has already plowed his own furrow in the field of major infrastructure projects, and is now sowing. This ambiguous situation emerged because of a cluster of party, political, and geostrategic reasons, which reach far beyond Bulgaria's borders.

The bad thing is that, in addition to being a strange situation, it is also an uncontrollable one. It must be stabilized as soon as possible, either through eliminating one of the axes, or by asserting both. Which of the two alternatives will be selected will become evident at the presidential elections.

EU Statement on Restarting Kozloduy Reactor Unit

AU2710143395 Sofia Environment for Europe Ministerial Conference Handout in English 23-25 Oct 95

[Undated handout from the "Environment for Europe" Ministerial Conference entitled "European Commission Statement on Kozloduy"; obtained directly at the conference]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Since 1991, the Commission has provided 32 million ECU in assistance to improve the safety of Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant after a very critical report by the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA].

Many of the problems identified in the IAEA report have now been solved. One problem however remains in relation to Kozloduy Unit I—the oldest of the reactors. Western experts believed that the operational safety of reactor Unit I has not been fully demonstrated—and that further tests needed to be undertaken before Unit I was reopened. Despite requests from G7 and the European Union, Unit I was reopened on 4 October—without those further tests being carried out.

The Bulgarian Authorities have pointed to the problems for Bulgarian citizens if Unit I was not operational this winter. The EU has told the Bulgarian authorities it is ready to discuss alternative sources of supply, e.g., sending of electricity. The French Government has publicly offered to provide the energy shortfall, i.e., 440 megawatts of electricity free of charge in a joint-project with its EU partners.

This offer was repeated in a letter from Commissioner Van den Broek to Prime Minister Videnov on 19 October asking for the decision to be reconsidered.

That is where matters rest for the moment.

Gechev: EU Accepts Our Stance

AU3010130795 Sofia PARI in Bulgarian 26 Oct 95 p 6

[Article by Deputy Prime Minister Rumen Gechev: "Europe Accepts Our Position on Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant First Reactor"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Naturally, there was talk about Kozloduy both within the framework of the "Environment for Europe" Ministerial Conference and outside it. I met the Spanish minister, who was authorized to speak on behalf of the EU. We agreed on the following:

First, politics should not be involved in setting the nuclear safety standards. The Bulgarian Government will not adopt a decision to shut the reactor down as a result of outside pressure that is not backed by any serious evidence.

Second, our government is interested in improving the nuclear safety of the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant. Moreover, the specific results of our government's economic policy categorically show that Bulgaria is overcoming its economic crisis, something that allows us to allocate more means to environment protection. Therefore, on behalf of the government, I expressed concern with the fact that Europe is concentrating its attention on Kozloduy, while there are much older reactors throughout Central and East Europe. So far, we have received no official demand to shut the reactor down that has been supported by any evidence. On the contrary, we have a mountain of expert evaluations, according to which everything is in order at Kozloduy. Then why is the EU protesting precisely against the first reactor of the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant? We agreed that we will not discuss the topic before we receive answers to those questions of ours.

Third, we have heard proposals from many sides to compensate us for the losses caused by the reactor's shutdown. We are prepared to negotiate the compensation issue. However, first we would like to know who will compensate us—full name, ID card number, and bank account, please. This is because we have already heard tales about compensation regarding the embargoes against Iraq and Serbia.

The last thing we stressed categorically was that we disagree with destroying the reactor because of engineering experiments. In other words, the character of the samples must be such that the integrity of the construction will not be violated and the reactor will be preserved.

Finally, if an agreement is reached on compensation, if the scope satisfies us, and if technical implementation is possible, we are prepared to begin talks on shutting down the reactor. However, I repeat, we mean specific negotiations on the issue of nuclear safety that should not be related to any political pressure.

The Spanish minister says that he understands and accepts the Bulgarian position.

Polling Institutes: Socialists Score 'Easy' Win

AU2910212795 Paris AFP in English 2007 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Sofia, Oct 29 (AFP)—The ruling Socialist Party scored an easy win Sunday [29 October] in Bulgarian municipal elections, two polling institutes said. The Socialists, formerly the communist party, won 42 percent of the votes against 24 percent for the main opposition grouping, the Union of Democratic Forces, according to the Honest Elections polling organization. The Bulgarian branch of the Gallup organization gave the Socialists 40 percent and the anti-communist opposition grouping 23 percent.

The ruling party went into the election hoping to turn economic success into support in Bulgaria's major cities. These have so far been bastions for the anti-communist Union of Democratic Forces, sworn enemies of Socialist Party.

Since the Socialists took over in legislative elections in December, winning 125 of the 240 seats in parliament, Prime Minister and Socialist leader Jean Videnov has managed to slash inflation. For the first nine months of the year it stood at 23.2 percent compared to 87.3 percent for the same period in 1994, while production has gone up five percent this year. Unemployment has also decreased, from 16.5 percent in January 1994 to 10.5 percent now, according to the government. Only the crime figures have remained static.

Mayoral races are decided by a first-past-the-post system. However if none of the candidates wins more than 50 percent of the vote in the first round, the three candidates with the largest number of votes go into a second round which is to be held in two weeks.

Seven SDS Mayors Elected

AU3010080295 Sofia Khorizont Radio Network in Bulgarian 0700 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Zlatina Georgieva reports from the Central Electoral Commission:

[Georgieva] The Central Electoral Elections already has new provisional results. So far, 64 percent of the returns have been processed. Some 53 percent of the voters have voted. According to the information processed by the Central Electoral Commission, mayors have already been elected in several settlements. Mr. Dimitur Dimitrov will tell you about it.

[Dimitrov] Candidates of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] and coalition have been elected in many settlements. There are certain exceptions. Thus, in Veliki Preslav, a mayor from the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] has been elected. An exceptional result—a local coalition has won the elections in Dupnitsa. It consists of the People's Union, the Bulgarian Business Bloc [BBB] and certain smaller parties. They defeated the candidates of the BSP and the SDS. A red [BSP] mayor has been elected in Silistra. In Troyan, the situation will be decided in a second round.

[Georgieva] We turn now to Emiliya Venkova at the Sofia City Electoral Commission.

[Venkova] Only 15 minutes ago, the chairman of the Sofia City Electoral Commission reported the following: The final results of Sofia elections will be ready somewhere around 1200 [1000 GMT], however, we could categorically announce that seven blue [SDS] mayors have been elected in 7 Sofia municipalities—Triyaditsa, Vuzrazhdane, Lozenets, Sredets, Oborishte, Bankya, and Vitosha.

In anything related to the elections for Sofia mayor, so far, according to the calculations, Stefan Sofiyanski has received 44.40 percent. Ventsislav Yosifov has received 31.90 percent. The results mean that, in the seven aforementioned Sofia municipalities, there will be no second round. Otherwise, there will be a second round on 11 November.

Havel Calls For Quick Decision by West on NATO

LD3010095395 Berlin DDP/ADN in German 0330 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Prague/Dresden (DDP/ADN)—Czech President Vaclav Havel has called for a speedy decision to be made on the eastward expansion of NATO. "Of course, the longer a decision on expanding the alliance is delayed, the greater Russian resistance is going to get," Havel says in a television interview with Mitteldeutscher Rundfunk [Central German Television]. The interview is due to be screened this evening, marking Havel's meeting in Dresden with German President Roman Herzog.

Havel described Russia's position that expansion of the Atlantic alliance would mean old enemies facing each other again as "an attitude from the period of the Cold War." For this reason alone the West should not grant Russia a veto on the accession of former Warsaw Pact members. "To do this would be to misunderstand the signs of the times—in other words, the search for an overall European peace order free of spheres of influence," Havel said.

Referring to the betrayal by the Western powers in the so-called Munich Agreement in 1938, when Britain and France agreed to the separation of the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia rather than oppose Germany, Havel said: "The West paid a terrible price for its own appeasement policy, so let us hope it has learned from this."

Havel described the failure by Sudeten Germans dispossessed after the World War II to drop demands for a return of their property as a major hurdle on the path to improved German-Czech relations. "The Czechs would welcome it if demands were not revived in Germany that are in any case unrealistic and unrealizable, especially legal claims and claims to property," Havel said. He said the issue should form a substantial part of the German-Czech declaration that government politicians form both countries were working on. Havel said it was "high time" Czech concentration camp victims received compensation from Germany. [passage omitted]

Havel on EU, NATO, Trip to Germany

LD2910161795 Berlin DDP/ADN in German 1425 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Chemnitz/Dresden (DDP/ADN)—Czech President Vaclav Havel has accused West Europe of being too careful about his country's integration into the EU and NATO. Ahead of his visit to Dresden on Monday, Havel told the Chemnitz daily FREIE PRESSE (Monday edition) that he had expected "a little more political courage and generosity" from the West with regard to Czech membership in the two organizations.

Portugal, which used to be ruled by a dictatorship, was integrated into the euro-atlantic structures much faster and much more easily, Havel said, adding that this hesitation could turn against the West in the future. After all, nationalists everywhere are waiting for an opportunity, he said.

With reference to the still outstanding declaration by the German and Czech Governments on their past, Havel said the past needed to be discussed openly. This was one of the tasks of the official Czech-German commission of historians whose meeting in Dresden on Monday he and German President Roman Herzog are due to attend.

"From a legal and political point of view, we should, however, not go back to the past," Havel said. "History cannot be reversed, and we would only reestablish the traditional old enmities." This should be the content of the declaration by Germany and the Czech Republic, Havel said, adding that his partners in the talks—Herzog and Kurt Biedenkopf, the minister president of Saxony—also have a clear position on this issue.

On NATO, Mideast Peace Process

LD2910162695 Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network in Czech 1315 GMT 29 Oct 95

["Conversations at Lany" interview with Czech President Vaclav Havel by Zuzana Vakrckova on 29 October—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Vakrckova] Mr. President, you spent almost all of last week in New York attending the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. [passage omitted]

You held a number of meetings and talks with important politicians. On 21 October, you met Bill Clinton, and, among other things, you discussed the Czech Republic's membership in NATO. The issue has become sort of a political evergreen. What is your view of the speech delivered by Boris Yeltsin on this issue? You said that in this matter time was running against us.

[Havel] The issue of NATO's expansion is an evergreen not only in our case, in the Czech press and media, but also in the United States and probably also in other countries. The issue is in fact not whether the Czech Republic joins NATO in a one, two, or three years' time. More is at stake—namely, the task of forming a new order in Europe and subsequently in the world.

There used to be sort of an order here—the bilaterally divided world, where sort of a pseudostability existed, brought about by mutual intimidation. The world nowadays is totally different; it is multipolar. The great and pressing task of our times is to search for a new order to satisfy us all, to enable us to express our individual identity and, at the same time, to make it possible for us to live in peace with others. The issue of NATO's expansion is a part of this big global issue. [passage omitted]

As regards Boris Yeltsin's address, my personal impression is that the tone of his speech was relatively sober, more sober than, for instance, his address at the recent Budapest summit of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which I also attended.

[Vakrckova] As we have already mentioned, you met a number of important politicians and statesmen. Our media now speak a lot about a visit by Yasir 'Arafat, whom you invited to visit the Czech Republic. In fact, it would be his second visit—he was here in 1990. Mr. President, why do you think this has alarmed some of our politicians, and why is this invitation so much discussed?

[Havel] To a certain extent, I do understand these doubts. However, at the same time, I do not understand why anybody should be surprised. In my view, the policy of the Czech Republic is based on support for all peace processes in the world, on our wish for peace in the world. At least while I am president, this will be our policy.

Naturally, I invited Israeli Prime Minister Rabin. Israeli President Weizman will visit our country in January. I invited King Husayn and the Jordanian president [as heard], and I repeated the longstanding invitation for Yasir 'Arafat. I consider this to be a natural thing because I invited all of the key partners in the current peace process in the Middle East.

This invitation is to show our interest in the peace process and our participating in both the reconstruction of the autonomous Palestinian territories and, in general, economic cooperation with the entire Arab world, with Israel and the Middle East. [passage omitted]

If Yasir 'Arafat is really coming to our country, his visit would no doubt take place only after the elections in the autonomous territories, and he would be arriving as a regular president elected in the elections—nobody doubts he will be elected in the January elections—as the regular president of an autonomous state with certain links to Israel.

Whatever our view of Yasir 'Arafat's past and of some things he did in the past, 'Arafat is somebody without whom we can hardly imagine the current peace process. He is the real partner of Israel, having invested in the same way as Israeli Foreign Minister Peres and Prime Minister Rabin many months and years in bringing into existence the peace process, which is facing great opposition in both the Palestinian and the Israeli camps.

I consider it important to finally put a peaceful end to the Middle East conflict. I think it is in the essential interest of the Czech Republic to support this process and all of its key actors.

[Vakrckova] Speaking at the United Nations, you expressed yourself in favor of not only Tibet's autonomy but also Taiwan's membership in the United Nations. Your latter statement contradicts the policy of the Czech Foreign Ministry. Some commentaries described your statement as a very undiplomatic one that might weaken the weight of our policy in the world because the two statements contradict each other.

[Havel] First of all, at the United Nations I never suggested Taiwan's UN membership. I merely answered a question at a news conference when asked my view of the fact that Taiwan is not a member of the United Nations, one of very few states in the world. I said that I was sorry about it, that I considered this to be a sorry and sad state of affairs. This is the view held by almost everybody, by democrats throughout the world.

By sometimes expressing views shared by everybody else but not publicly mentioned by others, I am helping the Czech Republic, I am helping its prestige. [passage omitted]

Government To Be Inoculated After Dlouhy Illness

AU2710174995 Prague PRAVO in Czech 25 Oct 95 p 1

[Report by CTK and "(zaj, hck)": "Dlouhy Has Hepatitis; the Government Is To Go for Inoculations"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Prague—The whole government will be inoculated on account of the jaundice-type illness contracted by Vladimir Dlouhy, trade and industry minister and Civic Democratic Alliance deputy chairman. The head of the Government Office, Igor Nemec (Civic Democratic Party), confirmed this for PRAVO on 24 October. Doctors are to inoculate the ministers in the government building before today's session. According to Nemec, no consideration is being given to a government quarantine or other special health measures.

Minister Dlouhy is infected with viral hepatitis A, with slight signs of jaundice. He is undergoing infusion treatment and his overall condition is good. This information was given to PRAVO on Tuesday by Vilma Maresova, the head of the infectious diseases unit at Na Bulovce Hospital. In reply to a question on when the minister would recover, she said: "You are asking me exactly the same thing as the minister. I do not know." According to her, the course of this type of jaundice is easier.

Daily Questions Clinton's Praise of Kovac

AU2710175895 Bratislava HOSPODARSKE NOVINY in Slovak 24 Oct 95 p 10

[Commentary by "br": "Honor"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Since last weekend, we are richer by one reformer. According to a news agency report from Cedar Rapids published on the front page of yesterday's NARODNA OBRODA, this successful reformer is Slovak President Michal Kovac. This honor was bestowed upon him by no less than U.S. President Bill Clinton, who, according to NARODNA OBRODA, "expressed support for the reform efforts of Slovak President Michal Kovac and appreciated the successes he has scored in these efforts to date."

It is beyond doubt that, following the dramatic post-1989 fall in the GDP by several tens of percent, the Slovak economy is trying to get back to the level where it already was. It was probably this achievement that the U.S. President had in mind when he said that "the Slovak Republic has achieved considerable progress." It does not seem, however, that Michal Kovac's reform efforts have contributed more to this than the efforts of other Slovak politicians—quite the contrary. On these efforts lies the dark shadow of the suspicious activity of the president's son, who, if the charges from the FRG are confirmed, abused the rules of the reformed economy for criminal activity.

Commentary Notes Clinton's Avoidance of Meciar

AU2710174795 Bratislava SME in Slovak 25 Oct 95 p 4

[Commentary by Peter Toth: "The Investigation Will Be 'Widened'"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The clarification of the circumstances of the abduction of the president's son abroad is deadlocked, not only because two investigators have already been dismissed in the course of the investigations but, in particular, because each piece of evidence comes to a halt before the doors of the office of Ivan Lexa, director of the Slovak Information Service [SIS], who refuses to relieve the suspects, his subordinates, of their vow of silence. Each investigator who would attempt to interrogate an SIS staffer without his being relieved of the vow of silence would make himself guilty of a criminal act, and Ivan Lexa would bring charges against him. However, should the investigator file charges against an SIS member, Prosecutor Robert Vlachovsky will either drop the charges or Ivan Lexa will turn down the request to lift the vow of silence, or both. In this situation, every suspect from the SIS can feel safe because his highest superior will give him backing and, if necessary, will make up a story about where he was at the time of Michal Kovac Jr.'s kidnapping. Therefore, it is Ivan Lexa himself who stands in the way of the consistent investigation of the criminal act. The only person who could force him to change his stand is Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar, who, however, stands firmly behind his protege and, according to information imparted by Jan Carnogursky, information that even some Interior Ministry officials did not rule out, had himself consulted with Interior Minister Ludovit Hudek on personnel changes in the team of the "Kovac affair" investigators. Given these circumstances, it is not surprising that, of all of the Slovak political representatives, U.S. President Bill Clinton tends to meet only with President Michal Kovac, while avoiding meeting Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar. The "interventions" by Jozef Sestak, state secretary at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who suggested to Clinton that he should also meet with Meciar, are futile in this respect. A prime minister who accepts and protects a secret service chief such as Lexa can look for partners only in some countries of the eastern hemisphere.

It is becoming apparent that the scope of the investigation of this case will soon widen—for example, to the verification of the two letters from Branislav Chilo-Ptak, who claims that the young Kovac staged the kidnapping himself. Another possible direction developments will take was suggested by the secret service director himself in his open letter to President Michal Kovac, in which he said that it is in the interest of SIS to clarify the circumstances under which the president's son was arrested by the Austrian authorities on the basis of an international arrest warrant. It seems that the Technopol affair, which the government press has been "skillfully" unfolding since the beginning of this year, will enter the game again.

Article Queries Report on U.S. Envoy's Statement

AU3010113895 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 26 Oct 95 p 1

[Article by "suj, isa": "U.S. Embassy Denies TASR Report: Theodore Russell Did Not Term Clinton's View 'Very Positive'"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Bratislava—Yesterday we published a TASR report on the reception of U.S. Ambassador Theodore Russell by Ivan Gasparovic, chairman of the parliament. According to this report, Lubos Jurik, spokesman for the chairman of the National Council of the Slovak Republic, said that Theodore Russell had assured the highest representative of the Slovak legislative body of his country's unabating interest in developments in Slovakia and its democratic development. "He quoted U.S. President Bill Clinton's words, in which he very positively assessed developments in the Slovak Republic," the TASR report stated. The U.S. Embassy yesterday denied this part of the report. [passage omitted] In the course of the day, we repeatedly tried to contact Lubos Jurik but were unable to reach him. We therefore approached the TASR correspondent. He said that, even though, in writing the report, "a part of the text was erased" from the computer, he does not have the feeling that this fundamentally changed the meaning of Lubos Jurik's statement. Under the headline "U.S. Embassy Clarified Information on Ivan Gasparovic's Meeting With Theodore Russell," TASR yesterday issued the text of the [U.S. Embassy] denial. Lubos Jurik asked TASR to publish that he confirms Theodore F. Russell's statement.

Meciar Reacts to Comments on Democracy

LD2710225795 Bratislava Rozhlasova Stanica Slovensko Network in Slovak 1736 GMT 27 Oct 95

[Regular Friday interview with Slovak Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar by Martin Dobos, in Bratislava on 27 October—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Text] [Dobos] How do you view the circumstances that led representatives of the European Troikato to visit you two days ago? And what led to a similar stance from the U.S. Embassy in Bratislava? Both documents express disquiet over internal political developments in the Slovak Republic. So do you think that democracy in Slovakia is under threat? Are we, as an associated country, preparing to enter the European Union as the government committed itself to doing in its policy statement, or are we not?

[Meciar] There is no doubt about the fact that the Slovak Republic is a democratic country. There is a whole host of international documents and views of international institutions that judge it to be democratic. It is therefore a disgrace on the part of all those in our country who cast doubt on democracy as a system of relations and who seek guarantees of democracy in an individual. There are [words indistinct] institutions in the constitution for that purpose. There is the parliament that has to work, and, although it works on a majority principle, it is still democratic. There is the government, which is a coalition made up of four entities but still works. There are independent courts, including the Constitutional Court, which function independently and their rulings are respected. It is not possible for a citizen's rights or for a person to be denigrated because everyone has an institutional guarantee of being able to go to court so as to achieve their rights.

That is one block of problems connected with democracy. There is also a host of institutions and political entities that are maturing, but the trend is undoubtedly as democratic as in any postcommunist state, including those that consider themselves as being in the lead in this respect.

The second point is connected with what could have led the countries of the European Union to their point of view. Unfortunately, I have to add that, at the time of this interview, I am not familiar with the U.S. stance.

The European Union standpoint is not, I would say, unfriendly. It was a communique reflecting certain facts in our domestic political life. I do not wish to analyze its contents now, but I will answer the question why, as I see things.

The geopolitical order of the world is being formed. We have aligned ourselves with a certain direction, which remains unchanged. The government's policy statement is valid and not open to question. On the other hand, along with the formation of this geopolitical order, the interests of other states are in play. There are the United States, NATO, the Western European Union—the Federal Republic of Germany is also important, as are other states, including the Russian Federation. This is the beginning of geopolitical movement leading to increased interest in Central Europe. Slovakia is not an insignificant country in this geopolitical situation. On the contrary, it is exceptionally important. It is the focus of interest from many quarters, but not everyone considers the interest of another state as being consonant with the view of our government, which is not the same. [sentence as heard]

Then a package of problems opens up inside the state. There is the problem of the president of the Slovak Republic, who is responsible for much of what has happened. It could be said that this is his baby because, when he spoke in the Federal Republic of Germany, he [words indistinct]—for example, the words that I am turning to Russia—and he warned others that they should start taking this very seriously. As if there were to be a change in the government's political course, which is not true. Similarly, other proclamations about the development of democracy in Slovakia made by our own head of state are the only proclamations anywhere in the world in which a head of state casts doubt on the state as a whole for his own personal reasons. It is a disgrace for us.

[Dobos] In this context, you mentioned the president. On his return from the United States yesterday, he said that some representatives of the government coalition seem to be sticking their heads in the sand and refusing to face the reality of our current situation. He went on to say that 15 European Union countries and the United States have expressed certain alarm not because of the president's raising hell but because of their serious alarm over the steps taken by the government so far in the past and at present. Thus the words of President Michal Kovac totally contradict what you have just said, Mr. Prime Minister. What is your view of these statements?

[Meciar] I would not say that the president is raising hell; he is fooling around. [Ze pan president vycina, on skor santi]

However, as regards the issue of the European Union, the signals about the possibility of not necessarily democratic developments in our country are clearly coming not from the government, parliament, the government coalition parties—they are exclusively coming from the president.

The communique delivered to us in substance intended to draw our attention to the fact that any anticonstitutional steps against the president would be undesirable. This does not mean that constitutional steps are ruled out. As regards the circumstances, my view is that this problem is of internal political significance, above all because of the harm done to the state.

Unfortunately, it is I who has to explain the government's views and policies, and thus I am indirectly pushed into the position of an actor in the president's play. However, I do not feel like being such a protagonist because, for a good two years, Mr. Michal Kovac has been in conflict with a great part of the population in this state. He is unable to cooperate with parliament or the government, he is unable to cooperate with the parties of the government coalition.

For this reason I think there should be (?greater) cooperation in this sphere. Things happen here that are not really proper. For instance, during my trips abroad, whenever I meet heads of state I convey our president's message inviting them to visit Slovakia. It is not proper when, for example, during talks with President Clinton, it is our state secretary who tells President Clinton that as state secretary he is asking him to hold talks with the parliament chairman and with the prime minister as well, so as to hear the views of the other side, too. President Clinton's reaction was not negative. The thing is that on such occasions our president keeps silent. This is not normal. And there are a number of such mistakes about which it is difficult to speak in public. They have to be decided by parliament or by our citizens in a referendum.

Internal political problems in Slovakia will not be tackled in any way other than democratically.

[Dobos] Does this mean that you will initiate a referendum?

[Meciar] The government is unable to do so. This matter can be decided by parliament only. In this situation the important thing is that the situation is discussed by parliament and that a decision is made by parliament.

[Dobos] This might be a slight paradox, but, on his return from the United States yesterday, the president more or less proposed the same thing, saying that the internal political situation should be discussed by the National Council as soon as possible.

In this context, I would like to ask you yet another question. Let me quote the Slovak president, who said on his return from the United States yesterday that his statements did no harm to Slovakia's good name; on the contrary, Slovakia's name was being harmed by some statements made by the coalition.

[Meciar] Once you accept, as I do, the principle that everybody is innocent until an independent court decides on one's guilt and delivers a verdict—in that case the president cannot say this about the government. He cannot say in Germany that it is necessary to take into account the possibility that all of a sudden it might happen that a situation could emerge in which it would be difficult to form a new government (?or) to preserve this government. Do these strong words not destabilize the situation—hinting publicly at the possibility that the political situation might change? Can anybody fail to take notice of that? Can anybody fail to take notice when it is being said abroad that democracy in our country is threatened? We are asking by what steps, by what actions, by what deeds. Is it possible not to take notice when doubt is being cast on Slovakia's foreign policy orientation? As if Slovakia's government policy statement would not have included it all. For God's sake [words indistinct].

These are the things masquerading as reality. In the case of perceiving them as unequivocal facts, the European Union countries would react more strongly. Everybody understands that the situation is complicated, and, therefore, everybody is calling for democratic solutions. And these are guaranteed by the government.

[Dobos] Prime Minister, are you going to react directly to the communique handed to you the day before yesterday by the representatives of the European Union? Is the fact of the communique and its content going to influence the style of your government's policy?

[Meciar] I am asking in what sense this policy is bad. Does it contradict our laws? No, it does not. Does it contradict the interests of our state? No, it does not. Is it bad because I stress that once an intention is approved it should be implemented? Is government policy bad when all economic and social experts throughout the world now praise it?

The fact is that the political situation, the internal political situation, is not formed by the government. To think so is a big mistake. It is formed between the subjects on the political scene and parliament. The government does not make the laws of this state. Therefore, to ascribe some things to the government or to the prime minister is tantamount to putting one's head in the sand because the substance of political life is beyond the government's powers.

The good results so far achieved by the government have been achieved only thanks to the fact that the government has been more or less apolitical, apolitical in the sense that it has been fulfilling its program statement without getting involved in the conflicts of political parties—that is, until the president began to attack the government, accusing a minister of corruption [words indistinct] abroad, without proving a single case of corruption.

Is this not enough for us to be able to say that the president is disrupting the constitutional structure, the government, blackening its name and causing damage to its moral structure? We should care for our state and not for ourselves. The truth is that the president polarizes our political scene. The other truth is that, given his personal qualities, he is very easily replaceable.

This means that the situation between us is not that the government is trying to usurp power. The Constitution does not give much power to the government; it does not have extensive powers. However, it can (?lead) a consensus between political subjects in reaching agreement on the vote to shorten the [presidential] term of office, on the date of a new [presidential] election, and on who it is going to be.

The government does not need to have any powers, not even for 24 hours. If it gets them, the government publicly promises that, apart from the functions of protocol, it will not carry out any other presidential functions.

The political parties represented in parliament cannot work according to their narrow party interests, keeping Michal Kovac as their shield or standard under which they launch the struggle for their own interests—not his interests, not the interests of the state, but their own interests.

[Dobos] Nearly all opposition parliamentary parties and movements declared, either today or yesterday, their support for the president.

[Meciar] I would not say so. I read it quite properly, and, inasmuch as I also read what is not directly spelled out, I know that it is a different matter.

[Dobos] Prime Minister, to sum it up—what ways out do you see in general terms from the internal political situation that is all the time growing more tense and that [words indistinct] is not contributing to Slovakia's further development? On one side there are economic successes, on the other a certain internal tension.

[Meciar] Let us look at the decisive [words indistinct] of this situation. Our parliament has expressed its vote of no confidence in the president. The president is ignoring the parliament; he is ignoring parliament as regards the content of its deliberations and in his communications with the parliament. He is ignoring its political point of view. [passage indistinct]

There is a document, originating after the vote of no confidence, in which the president asks constitutional officials for intelligence documents. Nothing of this kind happens elsewhere in the world. It is happening in Slovakia, despite the president's public denial. I have a copy of that letter, which he filed as top secret. I am prepared to make it public. [passage indistinct] The government is open. I have publicly asked other political subjects to join the government, to start talks about it if they wish. However, do not expect the government to collapse. Under my leadership it will not.

We have proved ourselves capable of solving the most difficult [word indistinct] historical situations for the Slovak Republic, and we are continuing to solve them. An offer of cooperation has been addressed to the president. I shook his hand when I was not obliged to. He does not want my hand.

However, the question is no longer that of the president and the constitutional institutions. The issue is that of our state and its acceptance by the international public. It is a complicated one.

[Dobos] Nevertheless, you are an optimist as regards its solution in the future, are you not?

[Meciar] Of course. I am an absolute optimist. This cannot result in anything else. That person is not of such importance to force us to do anything harmful to Slovakia.

Comment: Kovac Kidnapping Work of Opposition

AU2810145495 Bratislava SLOVENSKA REPUBLIKA in Slovak 26 Oct 95 p 3

[Commentary by Juraj Fuchs: "President Endeavors To Abduct Democracy"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Michal Kovac Sr. has been incessantly attempting to abduct democracy from Slovakia. To this purpose, he uses all of the speculatively guileful tricks in the book when interpreting the concepts of law and democracy, which, of course, has nothing in common with ethics.

Michal Kovac Sr. made his first attempt at abducting democracy as early as the spring of 1993. He held a series of conspiratorial talks with members of the current opposition and with a representative of the East-West Institute from the United States.

Later, by his New Year's address in 1994, Michal Kovac Sr. made the attempt at abducting democracy obvious. Today we know that it was not just a disregard for the election results, but an appeal for a parliament coup by getting the "selfless" deputies to break the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia [HZDS]. Vasil Hudak, of the U.S. East-West Institute, discussed this matter with representatives of the opposition parties and encouraged them to carry out a parliamentary coup, which was a clear intervention in internal affairs of a sovereign state. He even had a list of names of the members of the new government. In other words, he acted like a sovereign in a banana republic. His gamble worked—at least for a while. With the aid of some deputies, the president toppled the government of Vladimir Meciar by a parliamentary coup on 11 March 1994. The new government was legal but not legitimate because it fraudulently changed the election result and did not emerge from the will of the people.

They released a false report that a majority of 78 deputies out of 85 voted in favor of recalling Meciar and spread it throughout the world by means of foreign agencies. They omitted mentioning that the parliament has 150 deputies. That was a part of the morale of the anti-Meciar campaign abroad. The builder of a "state based on the rule of law" began to build the government program on fallacies. The government program was drafted by Frantisek Miklosko when he naively stated: Meciar out of sight, Meciar out of mind! It was a terrible mistake of all those involved with Michal Kovac in the lead.

The very next day after the elections, Kovac attempted to reverse the results, and, instead of asking the election victor, Meciar, he asked the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia in an attempt to break the movement from within. He held talks with various "representatives" on how to prevent Meciar's return. It did not trouble him in the least that he was violating the sacred principles of democracy and, in fact, abducts it from Slovakia. The concern over privatization of property worth billions was stronger than the values of democracy. All kinds of combinations of conspiratorial character failed, and eventually he had to entrust Meciar with forming the government. It took him a full month.

Nevertheless, Michal Kovac Sr. did not quit devising conspiracies against Meciar, and, in each interview, particularly in those granted either abroad or to be published abroad (the last one was carried by the Prague daily PRAVO), he has undermined the authority of the government of Vladimir Meciar and of Slovakia, claiming himself to be the only correct interpreter of democracy. He allegedly is the only one who knows what democracy is. He most likely learned it from Fidel Castro. He has proved by his deeds to be a tool of the opposition. The opposition is most interested in another toppling of the government of Vladimir Meciar, and therefore it is very likely that it even organized the abduction of Kovac Jr. with the alleged cooperation of the Slovak Information Service, which also employs members of the Christian Democratic Movement, people placed there by Moravcik's Leninist Spark and Cibula's people. The lenience toward or patronage of the president's son on the part of the Prosecutor's Office, which disregarded the international arrest warrant, misfired.

Defense Official Urges President Kovac To Resign

AU2710174195 Bratislava SLOVENSKA REPUBLIKA in Slovak 25 Oct 95 p 3

[Statement by Jozef Gajdos, state secretary at the Ministry of Defense of the Slovak Republic: "Will President Kovac Follow the Example of Willy Claes?"]

[FBIS Translated Text] There exist politicians of great format who know what their duty is when their presence in their post becomes damaging to the common interest. Unfortunately, this does not apply to the present president of the Slovak Republic. As a matter of principle, I do not like people who "preach water and drink wine." Looking back at his merits in the building of the Army of the Slovak Republic, I do not find anything that would support his authority as commander in chief of the Slovak Republic Armed Forces.

I have not registered the president's involvement in Army matters at deliberations of the Slovak Government, the State Defense Council, or the parliament. On the other hand, every day I register his activities in casting doubt on the Slovak Republic and, hence, on the government he had himself appointed.

Mr. President, it is time for you to ponder what will be of greater benefit to citizens—your efforts to cling to your post tooth and nail or resignation. You should follow the example of the experienced politician Willy Claes.

[Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak on 25 October on page 4 carries a 500-word commentary by Pavol Vitko entitled "In a Calming Way or Tooth and Nail?" Vitko says, among other things: "The most important aspect of Jozef Gajdos's statement is that, since the founding of the Slovak Republic, he is the first among the highest-ranking officials of the Ministry of Defense to have called in question the authority of the commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the Slovak Republic—the president. Thereby, he publicly extended the party-political battlefield of the government (Movement for a Democratic Slovakia) versus the president to the Ministry of Defense and, at the same time, to the very gate of the Army, which has until now been bipartisan. And this is dangerous, if for no other reason than because the Army has weapons of much higher caliber than 'tooth and nail.'"]

Journalists Protest EU Anti-Slovak 'Hysteria'

LD2710185995 Bratislava Rozhlasova Stanica Slovensko Network in Slovak 1700 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The Association of Slovak Journalists sent a letter today to the embassies of the European Union countries.

The letter says that, as regards the political situation in Slovakia, the Western media have chosen a new target for their attacks—that is, the democratically elected parliament and the government that emerged from free elections. The new wave of hysteria in the media also casts doubts on Slovakia's political orientation.

The Association of Slovak Journalists holds the view that it is demeaning for the country when its government is forced, because of Western journalists' ignorance, to state constantly that Slovakia is a democratic state that wishes to join the European Union and NATO, and that it solves its internal problems in a constitutional and democratic way.

Comment on New Hungarian Party, HZDS Links

AU2910134595 Bratislava SME in Slovak 24 Oct 95 p 4

[Commentary by Ondrej Dostal: "A Hungarian Movement Made to HZDS Order?"]

[FBIS Translated Text] At the 21 October constituent congress of the Hungarian People's Movement for Reconciliation and Prosperity [MLHZP], MLHZP Chairman Gyorgy Gyimesi denied rumors being spread, in particular among Hungarian journalists, that the movement was made to the order of the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (HZDS). Already in May, when the movement was registered, commentators were pointing out that a fifth Hungarian minority party was superfluous and voiced the fear that the MLHZP would become just another HZDS satellite. Those fears were formulated also by representatives of the parliamentary Hungarian Coalition.

The very fact that, in the preparatory period, the HZDS was the only party with which the MLHZP held talks, because other parties were not interested, is a noteworthy signal. Gyimesi's words "we were told that the HZDS considers us its partner party" arouse the distrust of the opposition parties—both among the MLHZP's natural left-wing allies, the Party of the Democratic Left [SDL] and the Social Democratic Party of Slovakia [SDSS], and its potential allies within the ethnic minority, that is, among the parties of the Hungarian Coalition. No less noteworthy is the fact that, although the money allocated for the press of the ethnic minorities had been distributed and exhausted, the minister of culture has complied with the request of a foundation close to the new movement and has released the sum of 500,000 korunas from the Pro-Slovakia fund to help it publish a weekly. The new movement also arouses other fears among its potential partners. On the one hand, its program rejects the idea of the nation-state, but, on the other, it wants to cooperate with a government in which one coalition partner, the Slovak National Party, clearly embraces this idea. The movement regards as the limits of minority policy the Council of Europe Framework Agreement and the Hungarian-Slovak Basic Treaty, but it rejects autonomy, which is expressly enshrined in Council of Europe Recommendation 1201, which is part of the treaty. It does not support a territorial and administrative arrangement that would change the ratio of the ethnic minority population, but it supports horizontal integration and the government's ideas on territorial and administrative arrangement, which lead precisely to that end. And, finally, the constituent congresses of political parties are usually attended also by delegations of parties "from the other side of the barricade." The only delegations present at the MLHZP congress were those of the HZDS and the SDL. The question marks that have surfaced in connection with the MLHZP's founding have not yet been answered. The program, which is rather general and reminiscent of the programs of [Slovak] left-wing parties, does not mean anything. Only the practical steps of the new party and the specific forms of cooperation with its supporters on the political scene will reveal the true face of this, already fifth, Hungarian political force. And they will also show whether the chairman's denial of rumors about a movement made to HZDS order was trustworthy.

New Forces Replace Guards on Southern Border

LD2910153695 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1400 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Fresh forces have replaced the border guard companies stationed on Hungarian areas bordering eastern Slavonia. Border Guard spokesman Attila Krisan said the border guard companies serving in the Siklos district carried out their task excellently. The Nyirbator and Budapest border guard companies will return to their base. They will be replaced by units from Gyoer and Szombathely. The border stretch in Baranya county was strengthened two months ago because of the tense situation on the other side of the border.

MSZP Deputies Support Stabilization Program

LD2910195495 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1900 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The parliamentary group of the larger government coalition party, the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP], is united in supporting the continuation of the stabilization program, but is not in agreement with the Finance Ministry regarding the resources to be allocated for local authorities and education.

At the same time, the MSZP's parliamentary group took the position that the situation of public employees should not further deteriorate and the costs of redundancies should be paid by the state.

What the parliamentary group expects from the 1996 budget is that the net government debt will not grow and inflation will stay under 20 percent. However, the parliamentary group would give more money for local government and education than planned by the finance minister.

[Finance Minister] Lajos Bokros will consider the increase possible, providing the deputies tell him from where the money should come.

Paks Nuclear Station Workers Hold Warning Strike

LD3010094295 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 0800 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The employees of the Paks nuclear power station began a warning strike an hour ago—it will last another hour. They want a 25 percent pay increase. They are of the view it is unacceptable that they cannot get a pay raise due to a government decision in March, although, Paks is the most efficient and profitable power station in the country.

Not long ago an official at the headquarters of the Hungarian Electricity Works said that only one of the Paks nuclear power station's four blocks has decreased its output by 25 percent, and this amount can be replaced from the reserves of the other blocks by the end of the stoppage. This means that the Paks workers' strike does not cause interruption in the country's energy supply.

'Further Strikes' Anticipated

LD2710213295 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1800 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] After the warning strike of the employees of Paks nuclear station planned for Monday [30 October], further strikes can be expected in the electricity industry before next week's government session. This was announced by the heads of the electricity industry trade unions who expressed solidarity with the Paks workers. As talks broke off in August, they said they cannot see much chance of reaching agreement on the compulsory wage increases even if the government changes its decision.

Mining industry workers will also join the stoppages if the government does not meet the energy sector workers' wage demands.

The train drivers officially announced that they feel solidarity with the Paks warning strike.

The interest representation bodies of the police, border guards, prison officers, firemen, customs officers, and army employees are making preparations for a nationwide demonstration. The leading body of the association of these trade unions set up a joint committee to organize the protest. They consider the action to be necessary because they cannot see a guarantee for parliament adopting the bill on service this year. The bill would provide for a new pay system expected to be introduced in January. They also fear that they will not get the budgetary support necessary in order to function.

At the same time, the member organizations of the armed and policing employees' trade unions are initiating talks with the ministers concerned.

Izetbegovic Heads Delegation to Ohio Talks

LD2910185395 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 1800 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Bosnia-Herzegovina will be represented by the following delegation at the negotiations in Dayton, Ohio, scheduled for 1 November: Alija Izetbegovic, president of the Presidency of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina; Haris Silajdzic, prime minister of the Republic and of the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina; Kresimir Zubak, president of the Federation; Jadranko Prlic, deputy prime minister of the Republic; Ivo Komsic, member of the Presidency of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina; Miro Lazovic, speaker of the parliament of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina; and Muhamed Sacirbegovic, foreign minister of the Republic and the of Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The seven-member delegation of the Republic and the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina will be accompanied by a team of experts from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the embassy of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina in Washington.

'Good Chance' of United State

AU2710190995 Paris AFP in English 1846 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Sarajevo, Oct 27 (AFP) — Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic expressed confidence Friday that upcoming peace talks in the United States would result in a unified Bosnia-Herzegovina.

"We go (to the talks) with a firm resolve to preserve a united Bosnia-Herzegovina. I think we have a good chance of succeeding," he told Bosnia-Herzegovina radio in an interview from New York.

"We will reject requests for a division of Bosnia-Herzegovina, regardless of which side they come from or which package it may come in," he said.

The Bosnian leader went on to argue that Bosnia was in a much stronger position militarily than it has been in the past.

The Sarajevo government, along with an uneasy Croatian alliance, has increased its territorial holdings from 30 to 50 percent of the nation since two weeks of NATO air strikes in late August and early September.

Talks are to begin in Ohio next week according to the terms of a cease-fire, which began on October 12.

Emphasizes Undivided Bosnia

LD2710223695 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 1900 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] President Izetbegovic has granted an interview for our correspondent. We are not able to carry the interview in full due to its length and sound quality. We are carrying the most interesting details:

[Begin recording] [Izetbegovic] We will, of course, go [to Ohio] with a firm stand — to preserve a single Bosnia-Herzegovina. I think our chances for this are great. We will ignore demands for the division of Bosnia-Herzegovina; they are not coming from our friends. They are coming from our domestic and foreign enemies, and from some unreliable friends who — as sometimes happens — come up with such projects regardless of the packaging [sentence as heard]. I think that our military and political position is quite good [word indistinct]. Our moral position in the world has been particularly strong from the beginning. Our political position has been growing from strength to strength, and it reached the necessary level last year. We have continuous support from the world for our [words indistinct], a single Bosnia-Herzegovina [words indistinct] a civilized state, whose supporters we have been from the beginning, a state based on rational human principles of pluralism, democracy, human rights, respect for the rights of national minorities, etc; i.e. the positions we have consistently advocated from day one, despite all challenges and temptations we encountered because of the events I have already mentioned, such as Srebrenica and the like. We did not allow any retaliation [words indistinct].

We have always said we are not against Serbs. We are against chetniks. Those who want to attack, let them attack the chetniks and not the Serbs, etc. This has been our position throughout. [passage indistinct]

[Correspondent] Since you mentioned [word indistinct] talks and the positions of the main players, it all goes to show that the sending of troops to Bosnia-Herzegovina after the signing of the peace agreement will be a major problem. What will our country's position be, given [words indistinct] the Russian troops and the troops of Islamic countries [words indistinct] and U.S. troops?

[Izetbegovic] In any case, we will be in a favorable position. Either the troops will be sent or the arms. We cannot be deprived of both. The [.U.S] Administration is in favor of sending the troops, Congress favors sending the arms. One of these options will win. At the moment, it looks more likely to me that the troops will be sent — a respectable force that [words indistinct], i.e. when the peace is signed [words indistinct] respect for all issues on which an agreement is reached. We will, of course, observe everything we sign. [Words indistinct] the other side, which will try to put a signature on something it does not intend to observe. [passage indistinct] All in all, our position is sufficiently strong. We will receive either one or the other. We cannot lose. [end recording]

U.S., Russia Closer to Agreement on Peace Force

LD2810141795 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1327 GMT 28 Oct 95

["Pool" item]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Brussels, Oct 28 (TANJUG) — NATO sources said on Saturday the US-Russian deal on forming a joint unit to support the Bosnia peace force was a big step forward in reaching a final agreement on Russia's participation in the operation.

Although Moscow still opposes the idea of placing its troops under NATO command, Russian Defence Minister Pavel Grachev's statement that he was convinced the problem would be resolved soon is very encouraging, the sources said.

They also confirmed that special UN envoy Kofi Annan would be coming to NATO headquarters next week to discuss the Bosnia mission with General Bernard Janvier and NATO council ambassadors.

NATO officials expect that a final draft of the Bosnia mission, with details concerning the size of the force and its financing, will be prepared by Annan's arrival.

The financing of the operation will naturally depend on the status of the Russian contingent.

Unable to finance its participation, Russia has proposed that the United Nations bear all the costs of the Bosnia operation, but this would automatically imply a joint command of the international peace force which NATO has been refusing to accept.

Federation VP Ganic Interviewed on Peace Process

LD2710165695 Zagreb HTV Television in Serbo-Croatian 2300 GMT 26 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] How to bring the Croatian-Bosniak federation into being as soon as possible, as well as how to institutionally consolidate the Federation as a state, was the main topic of talks between the Croatian president [Franjo Tudjman]; the president of the Federation, Kresimir Zubak; and the vice president of the Federation, Ejup Ganic. Following that meeting we talked to Bosniak politician Ejup Ganic, who is tipped by unofficial but reliable sources as the next prime minister of the government of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Federation. [passage omitted]

[Begin recording] [Announcer] What kind of arguments are you taking to Ohio to show that the federation is not something fragile but something that is based on sound arguments as regards the third party? What are your conclusions?

[Ganic] The federation should in fact arrive as a compact entity. In other words, if we have any disagreements we should resolve them before going to Ohio.

[Announcer] Which disagreements in particular?

[Ganic] The disagreements include dynamics and those small local sheriffs. These are the problems. We have, however, realized that the recovery of Bosnia begins with the Federation. There is a bit of, how shall I put it, a bit of concern, that perhaps these talks are attempting to place the Federation — where we insist on democracy — and this regime of Karadzic's — a fascist regime — under the same roof.

[Announcer] It seems that this is the intention of these Americans, Holbrooke and his team of negotiators. Would this negotiating position suit them?

[Ganic] Well, the Americans are building a house for us, not for themselves. Hence, they are not tuning these creature comforts to their standards. They rather want to finish, to take this problem off their agenda. It is we who should talk about the interior, suggest how things should take shape. On the other hand, as you can see, we are dealing with fascists. This fact must be in evidence all the time — how to reconcile under the same roof democracy and this Serb fascism. As you can see, Karadzic and Mladic have not been officially ousted yet. This is going to be the key problem. This is a test for Bosnia's integrity, so that under the same roof there is something that can exist.

[Announcer] Please tell me, this meeting that was held today at President Tudjman's, was there any concrete agreement on the symbolically important argument that you, in your capacity as a federation, are going to present at these negotiations in Ohio? Are you going to set up some body, such as perhaps a government?

[Ganic] Well, you see, in order to consolidate the Federation we must have a strong and competent government of the Federation. It should pass regulations across the entire territory of the Federation and install economic legislation and equal opportunities. Otherwise, the mafia will take over. We, Mr. Zubak and I, agreed earlier on the formation of an exceptionally strong government of the Federation. The Croatian state supported it, of course, for we — for us in Bosnia the most important segment of foreign policy is to forge links with the Republic of Croatia, regardless of the fact that sometimes these relations have their ups and downs.

The climate between the two peoples, however, is good. We politicians we can ruin this. As people say, if only the climate among you politicians were good. Hence, this is the basis for forging these relations. Today we talked about how the Federation could intensify cooperation with the Republic of Croatia, communications, trade, everything that stimulates the building of this Federation. The Federation is a way of recovery for Bosnia- Herzegovina. This is the only therapy that has been devised so far, the only way for the state to stand on its own legs.

[Announcer] If a government is formed, have you perhaps already agreed on and resolved how to distribute posts among the peoples?

[Ganic] First, this is going to be a government of experts...

[Announcer, interrupting] But you will certainly take account of...

[Ganic, interrupting] Of course we have tried everything else, and the best thing is to have a government of experts, people who know the problems. We are not going to go all the way in taking account of every group. In the federal Constitution there is some kind of global ratio. But one more or less is not a problem. In this context expertise will have priority.

[Announcer] Tell me, will Mr. Silajdzic continue to hold the post of prime minister? Apart from this, what is his position in this latest period within your Bosniak ranks? It seems to me that there have been some cracks in this. Or perhaps my impression is wrong.

[Ganic] Even within the Bosniak entity, you know, we have a wide range of political parties, opinions etc, which is good. On the other hand we have a federal government now. We have a government of the Republic that is acting as the federation's government at the same time. It is not really operating across the whole territory of the Federation. We have the Croat Defense Council [HVO] operating on that territory. There are functioning administrative regimes that differ from the regime that is in power in the territory controlled by the Army. We are therefore going to reorganize in a sense the current government, so we can have a smaller government of the Republic, a cabinet, while bearing in mind some segments of international policy, sovereignty, integrity, and such. A federal government then operates on the ground. In which case everyone, including Silajdzic, has pretty much the same chance in running for these posts.

[Announcer] Let us switch to next week, that is, that meeting in isolated circumstances, if I may say so, in Ohio, on an air base. It is more or less known what kind of negotiating guidelines the three sides will have on arrival. Perhaps we could first review what the Serbs intend to present, not just the Bosnian Serbs, but Slobodan Milosevic in his capacity as their representative. [passage omitted]

To what extent are their demands legitimate?

[Ganic] As regards the corridor, Serbs have always been a minority there. Likewise, Serbs have also been a minority in eastern Bosnia. In some pockets around Banja Luka they are still in the majority. The situation is such that this creation of Karadzic's lies on someone else's territory. This Serb population behind Karadzic, some 400,000 of them, they are in effect on territory which does not belong to them. This is the private property of Bosniaks and Croats. The war has resulted in a situation where Bosnia is no longer ethnically divided. [sentence as heard] These are very unrealistic demands because they demand this widening of the corridor for military reasons, as they plan to carry out military operations at a later stage. What Karadzic has in mind, however, is a matter of secession, of a separate state. After all, his range of movement will be limited no matter what the outcome is.

On the other hand, there were about 30-31 percent Serbs in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Their percentage is now far lower, about 15 percent. They cannot expect to get half a state while accounting for 15 percent of the population. If Serbs return to Bosnia-Herzegovina they will return to places where there is democracy. Those who live abroad have realized that fascism is a road to nowhere.

[Announcer] You have already said, I believe in an interview to VECERNJI LIST, that you maintain that this 49/51 percent division is unrealistic at the moment. How much, if we talk percentages, do you believe is realistically possible to give to the Serb side in Bosnia-Herzegovina?

[Ganic] One should first find out how much private property they own.

[Announcer] How much do they own?

[Ganic] Something in the region of 20 percent, probably less. Then there is state property, forests, etc. This is evenly distributed per capita. So when you outline these figures, these indicators, it is evident that they are demanding to legalize what they have conquered militarily. We cannot, though, make peace by stripping 50 percent of the Bosniaks of their property. Because tomorrow someone could set up a political party of these dissatisfied people who have lost their private property, thus undermining this whole peace concept. The same applies to Croats.

[Announcer] What is the percentage, then?

[Ganic] They know how much private property they have. I believe it is even less than 32 percent. This can be easily calculated.

[Announcer] Will the Bosniaks agree to swapping territory under any conditions? For example, Gorazde for Banja Luka, in the event of pressure from the negotiators, the Americans, to this effect?

[Ganic] Such surgical cuts, you know, these operations, require someone else's body. We were not elected to swap Gorazde for Banja Luka, and so on. It is a fact that Banja Luka has always belonged to the western part of former Yugoslavia. It used to communicate via Zagreb airport, its industry is compatible with industries in Croatia and central Bosnia. This is a fact one should bear in mind.

Then again, why should we trade something for something that is ours. Let the Serbs keep what they own. Let them learn how to respect private property. Respect for private property is the key thing for peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is something the Serb delegation is not capable of admitting.

[Announcer] Do the U.S. mediators agree with...

[Ganic, interrupting] You know, they agree. However, we have to be very careful because, regardless of however much the international community is in a hurry to complete this business, we have to work for the creation of a stable peace, you know.

[Announcer] Over a longer period of time, yes?

[Ganic] Yes, and we should not do a slapdash job.

[Announcer] Is Karadzic's demand for an outlet to the sea for this Serb entity legitimate?

[Ganic] This is ridiculous and quite unrealistic. This is, in fact, buying time. They will make such demands so that they can say that nothing is happening, and the desire here is for some conflict to arise again between Bosniaks and Croats so that everything is again [word indistinct], so that a theory of symmetrical aggression against Bosnia-Herzegovina might be developed, with the theory being that everyone was to blame in the former Yugoslavia, so that everyone should obtain resources for reconstruction, everyone should receive funds for reconstruction, and the hope is that people will forget that all this began with the Greater Serbia project. I think this is their strategy.

[Announcer] One more difficulty — one which we worry about a lot here in Croatia — is the question of the remaining occupied Croatian territory. It is Croatia's aspiration that this piece of territory should be included in a global package, so that sanctions against the so-called Federal Republic of Yugoslavia are not lifted until this issue is resolved in some way. Will the Bosniaks support Croatia's demand that this issue of the still occupied areas of Croatia should be included in a global resolution at the negotiations?

[Ganic] Listen, we also supported this. We want the Republic of Croatia to restore control over its territory. This would create a favorable climate for resolving the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Because, you see, if it is accepted [ako se patentira to] that the international community accepts procrastination over occupied Croatian territory, then everything is in question in Bosnia, too, you know. I personally support this problem of eastern Slavonia being resolved; it should be discussed immediately, and why not? I believe that what is interesting is that chetnik philosophy currently predominates in the Serb leadership. Let moderate and normal Serbs return [to the Serb leadership].

[Announcer] Is it realistic to expect this when the negotiators, the world negotiators, support Milosevic and even pronounce him to be the main person with the key to a solution?

[Ganic] Well, the world negotiators want, in some way, to push through some solution. At this time they consider Milosevic to be the only one who can secure something. However, they know full well what is happening. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] And finally, one more question: If the negotiations in the United States, despite all the pressure for a rapid and effective solution, develop in such a way that the Bosniak and Croatian side, or only one or the other side, refuse to discuss some matter, is the Bosniak side prepared for further military actions if this is the only way out?

[Ganic] Well, you see, a good part of our territory is still occupied. On the other hand, I believe that the Serb, or rather chetnik, leadership in Bosnia-Herzegovina is still not ready for peace, because none of their defined goals have been achieved. So there is a big question mark here. On the other hand, the international community is tolerating Serbo-fascism. They have been tolerating it for four years, so we are very careful. We want peace, but it must be a just peace, and the Serbs must spread themselves only as far as their own blanket, and if they do not there will be no stable solution.

[Announcer] Thank you, Mr. Ganic.

[Ganic] Thank you, too. [end recording]

Silajdzic Rejects Serb Demand To Return Areas

LD2910220295 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The minimum that we expect from the [Ohio] peace talks is the preservation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia-Herzgovina, and the setting up of a central government that would secure the integrity of the state, Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic said in Riyadh.

Silajdzic rejected Karadzic's demands regarding the return of the mainly Serb-populated areas and towns liberated by the Bosnian-Croatian forces in western Bosnia over the last three months. Karadzic is no longer in a position to make demands, Silajdzic said. At a news conference he drew attention to the radical change in the French policy toward Bosnia since Jacques Chirac became president. Silajdzic expressed his hope that Great Britain will also move along the same path.

Haris Silajdzic also expressed his gratitude to Saudi Arabia for its aid to Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Opposition Parties Comment on Negotiating Platform

AU2710202595

[FBIS Editorial Report] Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian during its 1800 GMT newscast on 27 October carries several reports on the reactions of "the opposition parties and associations of citizens" toward the platform of the Bosnia-Herzegovina negotiating team in Ohio.

"The Bosnia-Herzegovina Assembly did not form the platform for the talks. This was done by the Party of Democratic Action [SDA] in Fojnica, to which the SDA had no right, Mujo Kafedzic, vice president of the Muslim Bosniak Organization, said at the news conference today. The Muslim Bosniak Organization believes that other parties, too, should be given an opportunity to air their proposals for the resolution of the problems in Bosnia-Herzegovina," an announcer-read report states, making the reminder that this party earlier released a 20-point document, the main premise of which was "Bosnia-Herzegovina as an undivided state."

As the report further states "Kafedzic also put forward this party's demand that the Bosnia-Herzegovina Government not agree to NATO deployments along the separation lines, as this would lead to the Cyprusization of Sarajevo or something akin to the occupying zones in Berlin after World War II. Our country must demand a clear definition of the deployment of these troops and their mandate to avoid a repetition of what happened to our foreign minister who recognized the Serbian entity, which is inexcusable." Kafedzic reportedly stressed that "the multinational forces should be located exclusively on the border with Serbia and Montenegro." It is also reported that the vice president of the Muslim Bosniak Organization suggested to the Bosnia-Herzegovina negotiating team that they "not sign a clause of the peace agreement containing the right to call a referendum on the secession of an entity from the state."

"Speaking about the forthcoming peace talks in Ohio, the United States, the president of the Croatian Peasants' Party, Stanko Friskovic, said it was an encouraging circumstance that, parallel to the talks, a process for the establishment of the federation throughout the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina was under way," an announcer-read report states. However, the party president protested the fact "that a precise platform for the talks was not established, but the latter was supplemented with some party suggestions, as was the case with Point 21 of the SDA. The Croatian Peasants' Party believes that the opinions of other political parties should have also been taken into consideration."

According to the report, "one of the fundamental principles of the Croatian Peasants' Party for the peace talks is Bosnia-Herzegovina organized as a federation of its three peoples. A federation on the cantonal principle is the strategic backbone for the restoration of a lasting peace in Bosnia."

"Bosnia-Herzegovina should be organized on the federal principle because this is a just solution for all three of its peoples. The federative format of the country, which would consist of two entities, can only represent a transitional form for the ending of the war and introduction to general peace. In peacetime, such a bisected country cannot function long and, for that reason, the federation throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina territory should be our ultimate goal," the Croatian National Council is also reported to have proposed. The party also urged the return of all refugees, dismissed any resettlement of people and trade with territories as "criminal," and demanded that the perpetrators of the ethnic cleansing and war crimes be brought to justice. "Sarajevo, as the capital of the country, should enjoy the legal status of a district, and be under the direct control of the future federal government," the party also recommended, according to the report.

"The division of Bosnia-Herzegovina along ethnic lines would be a cause and a generator of new wars on the territory of the republic," the representatives of the council of Bosnian Sava Basin Congress and the Association of Northeast Bosnia, Derventa, and Bosanski Brod concluded jointly while visiting Sarajevo today, an announcer-read report states. Reportedly, they proposed that "Bosnia-Herzegovina be formed as a federation of cantons without any ethnic denominators within the internationally recognized borders." They supposedly also demanded that the Bosnia-Herzegovina delegation in Dayton talks "reject the so-called corridor through the Bosnian Sava Basin, which, in reality, means a denial of Bosnia-Herzegovina as an integral and sovereign country."

Intellectuals Contemplate Swiss-Type Organization

AU2910205795 Sarajevo Radio Bosnia-Herzegovina Network in Serbo-Croatian 1800 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Ahead of the peace negotiations in the United States, the Association of Independent Intellectuals Krug 99 [Circle 99] believes that the peace solution must not be based on the principle of ethnic division, and that the internal constitutional organization of Bosnia-Herzegovina must be based on the principles of a complex state such as Switzerland.

The will of the citizens of Sarajevo expressed in the declaration on the principles of the organization of their city must be strictly adhered to.

The Association Krug 99 calls for Bosnia-Herzegovina to be immediately accepted into the Council of Europe, the EU, and NATO. The function of NATO forces in the implementation of the peace agreement must be to preserve a unified and sovereign Bosnia-Herzegovina, and not to strengthen the internal divisions imposed by the war.

No one has the right to impose or accept a solution that would lead to the disappearance of Bosnia-Herzegovina as a sovereign state, says the statement of the Association of Independent Intellectuals Krug 99.

Serb Republic Objectives in Peace Talks Outlined

Karadzic Interviewed on Peace Process

AU2810212995 Banja Luka Srpska Televizija in Serbo-Croatian 2005 GMT 27 Oct 95

[Interview with Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic by Nikola Deretic on the "Ask the President" program in Banja Luka — live]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Deretic] Good evening. In the "Ask the President" program broadcast from the Banja Luka studio a month and a half ago, we gave you a chance to hear firsthand information about topical military and political questions from Radovan Karadzic, president of the Serb Republic and supreme commander of the armed forces. There have been many significant changes since then, both military and political. Consequently, we are well justified in greeting you in tonight's edition of "Ask the President" and, of course, in welcoming our dear guest, Serb Republic President Radovan Karadzic. Welcome, Mr. President.

[Karadzic] Thank you.

[Deretic] You know that this program is earmarked for our audience, and I do not want to shortchange them, so let me first briefly pose three groups of questions as an introduction to their questions. My questions concern defense, territory, and refugees. Could the Croats and the Muslims, regardless of the cease-fire, carry out more attacks on the Serb Republic defense lines? Of course, its borders have now narrowed down a bit. What is the guarantee that there will be no such attacks?

[Karadzic] You see, the people — that is, their army — must provide that guarantee themselves. A meeting with the representatives of the General Staff, the commander of the 1st Krajina Corps and the commander of the 2d Krajina Corps, was adjourned an hour ago, and they informed us about what was going on, forces they have at their disposal, their deployment, breaks, etc. I am now convinced that General Talic will do everything possible, and that he is doing his best, for I hold him directly responsible for this area. I trust him and I am convinced that such attacks would recoil upon our enemy. We have no guarantee that they will not attempt to do that. Perhaps they will even attack during the conference to put more pressure on our negotiators and to make them more flexible, although I am sure that the international community does not want to see any more war here in this region. The international community will simply not stand any more war for its own reasons, not for ours. Our soldiers must be alert. They can rest but must keep alert, keep an eye on the enemy, and be prepared to respond, although it has been made clear that the factual situation will not play a crucial role and that the factual situation of 8 September will be a starting point for negotiatons, for drawing maps, not by military means but through talks.

[Deretic] This would be your message to Serb defenders.

[Karadzic] Of course. Commands must function in the best way possible. This first of all refers to commanders of corps and corps commands in general, but also to brigade commands. We have determined and established the strictest possible discipline and disciplinary measures for mistakes. Nobody will ever again abandon their lines without orders to do so and yield to the enemy, because we will apply wartime laws with severe sentences that are pronounced and carried out very quickly. I demand that commanders of corps and brigades guarantee that they will fulfill their task, and they in turn should establish such discipline among their subjects that no mistakes go unpunished.

[Deretic] Which cards do our negotiating team, the joint team that is going to Ohio, has up its sleeve, so to speak, and do you really think that political negotiations can retrieve a sizable part of the temporarily occupied territory?

[Karadzic] Our team will take to Ohio the achievements of the Geneva and New York documents, which are actually a sequel to the same document, where the international community recognized the existence of the Serb Republic for the first time. The whole world, even the United Nations, sends us letters addressed to the leadership of the Serb Republic, president, government of the Serb Republic. They never used that term before. They just said the Bosnian Serb leadership. In other words, we will go to the talks with the achievements of three and a half years of successful war waging for defending our territory. Recent developments are something special and they have considerably weakened our position. However, if we were expected — at the time when we controlled almost 70 percent of the territory — to accept the 49:51 ratio, then the other side should also be expected — now that we control approximately the same percentage, a bit less than that — to agree to return a large part of territory. Especially here in Krajina, we base our hopes for retrieving the territory on two things: first, on getting up to 49 percent, based on 8 September, and second, on the fact that we will in other areas, because we must surrender communications, etc., cede so much territory here and there that we will be able to regain important zones and mountains, Mt. Grmec, for instance. These are two things on which we base our hopes. The third would be the matter of quantity and quality. If the Muslims want that we give them, in the zone of a town, an access and an exit that is small in quantity but significant and valuable in quality for them, they cannot count on exchanging a hectare for a hectare. They must give us 1:10 in such cases. Consequently, we base our hopes on three things.

[Deretic] Quantity for quality.

[Karadzic] Quantity for quality, to get up to 49 percent, and to cede some other areas with important communications, not towns but some areas. In some areas, we now control more than planned by any map so far. We are prepared to make some concessions in some areas that are not terribly important to us, so we could make up for that. We held meetings.... We spent two days with experts of the constitutional law and geography and with the FRY delegation. Our delegation and the FRY delegation undertook to support us in creating a high-quality, good, territorial solution and in finding a favorable constitutional solution. I am confident that our delegation, which forms part of the FRY delegation, will fulfill its task.

[Deretic] Do you think Yeltsin's illness could jeopardize the quality of the peace process, and if so, to what degree?

[Karadzic] It certainly would have been better if he had not fallen ill and if the negotiators had met at President Yeltsin's. Russia cannot be disregarded by anyone. Not even Clinton can afford to do that. Russia is naturally very important for the whole of Europe, especially for the Balkans. However, even if the Moscow meeting does not take place, Russia will become more influential every day. I hope that this will not impede the peace process. As I said, it would have been better if President Yeltsin had not fallen ill in the first place and if the meeting had taken place.

[Deretic] The third question: Refugees are our major concern. A large number of them still have not been properly accommodated. Do you think the Serb Republic has the strength to provide decent accommodations for almost all refugees this winter?

[Karadzic] You know that refugees are our first and foremost concern, my personal concern, and then follow families of soldiers who were killed in this war. Pensioners are also one of my major concerns, and I am truly grateful to them and would like to use this opportunity to thank them for their patience and patriotism. My thanks go to other categories as well. Regarding the refugees, there are several things that must be solved urgently. First, all of them must have collective accommodations. We have already done that. From collective accommodations, individual accommodations must be found for them as soon as possible. They must be accommodated in warm homes and live there with other families. Refugees who cannot go back to their homes this winter are to be given permanent accommodations. In other words, we must find accommodations for them. I am very pleased with what has been done so far. Out of 230,000 refugees, some 25,000 are still in collective accommodations, which means that 90 percent of the refugees are already accommodated in the homes of other families. Some 10 percent are still in collective accommodations that are not satisfactory, but at least they are not out in the open. Two or three thousand are still watching over their property on the streets, but we must take care of them soon. The town of Banja Luka has done a heroic deed. Last night at the session of the Serb Democratic Party municipal committee, we said that out of some 50,000 refugees that arrived in Banja Luka, 41,000 have already been put up privately. Optimists will say that we found decent accommodations for 80 percent of the refugees, while pessimists will say that we have not accommodated as many as 20 percent. But the Banja Luka authorities and citizens have done so much: 80 percent is so much more than 20 percent. Of course, we feel for the 20 percent and we must find proper accommodations for them as soon as possible, for we must open schools, etc.

Our second concern, once we have determined the borders and achieved our maximum, my personal concern and the concern of the ruling party and the state is to equate the present means of refugees with their means before they left their homes. Those people who left their property — say in Srbobran or Zenica, not to mention areas that we hope to regain — must be given a similar status regarding property, because we cannot allow to call our people in our country refugees. Even those in Zenica, Kakanj, and elsewhere who voted for the creation of the Serb state knowing that their area cannot be included in the Serb state, knowing that they will be refugees as long as the war lasts — we must consider all of them absolutely equal citizens of the Serb Republic and equate their status, make them landlords again, give them apartments, houses, some land and forest. When we have completed that state, when we have equated all our citizens and their property, only then can we start privatizing state-owned property.

[Deretic] Thank you. [passage omitted] My information is that Krajina has a bit more electricity tnoight, but at the expense of Posavina and Semberija, which have more power cuts tonight.

[Karadzic] Unfortunately, all of us will have to show solidarity and endure power cuts until we have sufficient production in Ugljevik and Gacko and satisfactory delivery of electric power to all parts of the republic. We should all show solidarity. Even Herzegovina, which produces enough electric power for its needs, is prepared and must be prepared to endure power cuts.

[Deretic] And now questions from our viewers. Has anyone in the republic taken the trouble to calculate the percentage of territory of the former Bosnia-Herzegovina that the Serb army now controls?

[Karadzic] Between 46 and 47 percent, we cannot be certain for there have been frequent changes to the separation line, but not less than 46 percent.

[Deretic] Can territorial demands specified by the National Assembly, which will be presented at the talks, fit into the 49 percent?

[Karadzic] Yes they can. We can compose a quite decent country from that. Our primary concern is to regain as much of Krajina as possible, to give as much strategic depth to Banja Luka as possible. I hope it will have at least 50 kilometers toward the south. Not a single Muslim town has that. Zenica, for instance, does not have such depth on any end. Tuzla is a border town. Our major border towns like Doboj, Sarajevo, and the like.... We can fit into that percentage. Of course, when we controlled 64 percent, it was much more difficult for us to create a map of 49 percent. Unfortunately, now the losses we incurred makes it somewhat easier to do that, but we still hope to get even more than 49 percent, because we have something the Muslims desperately need: the road out of Sarajevo, which we will not cede so lightly, at least not until we have been provided a satisfactory map.

[Deretic] The Muslims have also prepared a long list of demands for negotiations. They announce less concessions than 49 percent of the territory. What is the guarantee that the 49:51 ratio will be realized, considering the fact that the Geneva and the Washington talks did not produce firm written guarantees?

[Karadzic] The Geneva-New York document is the guarantee. I now refer to it as one document because Geneva produced items one through three, while New York added four, five, and six — which means that they are one document. The world already sneers at the Muslim demands and their attempts to avoid that which they had already undertook. That is their obligation and they cannot count on toying with the United States as they did regarding the Lisbon document or the Vance-Owen plan. They must fulfill what they undertook to do, and so do we for that matter. Consequently, we certainly have the guarantees of the international community and no member of the international community intends to revise something that has already been accepted.

[Deretic] Considering our negative experience during the cease-fire — I have already asked you this question — what guarantees do we have that the Muslims and the Croats will not launch a new attack?

[Karadzic] The people, the army, and the state institutions are the first and biggest guarantee. In other words, we must defend ourselves and repulse the enemy, let them know that we are prepared and that they will be defeated if they dare attack us. Second, this time it is the United States that is behind all that for the first time. So far, the United States has always stood aside watching Europe struggle, unable to give guarantees. However, the United States has instruments to put pressure on the Muslims to behave correctly.

[Deretic] If the Croats hold much more than 17 percent of the territory, which they were supposed to get after the division of former Bosnia-Herzegovina, what mechanism will force them to return the territory they occupied? Do you think they are willing to say: We cede the territory we occupied in favor of the Muslims?

[Karadzic] That is not our major concern. They formed a kind of federation. I was among the few in our leadership who welcomed the Washington agreement on the federation and confederation. Now my associates admit my gut feeling was right. They formed a federation and we do not care how they will go about.... We must get our territory. They are bound to fight among each other now and in the future. They will get a mini-Yugoslavia, and all the Yugoslav illnesses and squabbles will go to the Muslim-Croat Federation and the confederation with Croatia. The Croats will find it hard to cede some areas. They formed a federation before establishing which part belongs to the Croats and which to the Muslims. Consequently, the Muslims fell into a trap because they did not secure 33 percent for themselves in the federation, because that is unified territory. I think that will result in major conflicts.

[Deretic] How do you explain the military defeat on the western fronts in Krajina? Can you say the inhabitants of Krajina are poor soldiers, as some say, when those same people penetrated the corridor and fought successfully on other fronts?

[Karadzic] One cannot say they are bad soldiers. Quite the contrary, they are among the best soldiers in Europe. However, many factors lead to the defeat. We were winning as long as this was a civil war. Not in the sense of seizing Zenica, because that was not our goal, but in the sense that we defended our Serb Republic and all of its territory. This war ceased to be a civil war at one point. Croatia and its professional army, which was formed in the past four years since the crisis in Croatia ended, got involved in the war, and so did NATO. UNPROFOR [UN Protection Force] got involved at the very beginning. Rapid reaction forces even used their artillery. The Croatian Army entered our territory. Neither the Muslims nor the Bosnian Croats could harm us, regardless of our weaknesses.... I will never stop making changes in the army, nor will I stop insisting that some commanders of brigades and larger units who failed to make some necessary preparations and who made mistakes be held responsible. In other words, our weaknesses are one of the factors. Internal weaknesses of our state, our army, our organization is one factor but not a crucial one. I would like to say that the mistake of this or that commander was crucial, but the unfavorable ratio of forces was the crucial factor after all. There are 1.5 million of us. There were 4.5 million people in Bosnia. In other words, we are fighting against 3 million Muslims and Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In spite of the 1:2 ratio, we were superior. However, Croatia got involved with almost 5 million people, which is almost 8:1.5. And then we have NATO, rapid reaction forces, information and logistics support from the United Nations, credit given to Croatia for expanding its military budget, etc., and the fact that Croatia attacked Krajina. If Croatia had attacked central Bosnia, we would have had problems there. However, Croatia obviously knew that the whole world would make a fuss if it attacked the corridor. Serbia, i.e. FRY, would probably not remain idle either. They did try in Herzegovina, but they were not strong enough and our Herzegovinians resisted them.

However, the fall of Krajina opened almost as much as 300 kilometers of new front line that is to be defended with the same force. That was a big problem for the Krajina inhabitants, because Croatia borders on Krajina and vice-versa. The fall of Serb Krajina exposed a large part of our territory and that brought on the fall. Of course, I must repeat that I do not want to pardon our mistakes. We must make radical changes during this respite if more war will follow. I enjoy the wholehearted support of our people, the assembly, and our soldiers, for soldiers know exactly which officer is weak and irresponsible or untalented to lead an army. In the domain of security, moral and religious questions.... We will turn our army upside down and appoint courageous soldiers as officers for morale and security, as commanders of troops and battalions. In short, we will exclude all our weaknesses. But the world must understand that it cannot allow a country like Croatia to attack us, for that puts us in an absolutely unequal position. After all, FRY and the world powers that will guarantee this agreement must guarantee that something like that never happens again.

[Deretic] If the Assembly made a decision to replace Serb Republic Army high officers, what stands in the way of realizing this decision?

[Karadzic] Some of those officers think they can be saved merely by saying that they will not accept that. That is unheard of! An officer who is relieved of his active duty and sent into retirement must do that. The fact that they have not yet been relieved of their duty means that they must finish some jobs in Yugoslavia. However, they are no longer legal or legitimate. Everything they do is not legitimate, for they are not members of our army after one signature. They should offer their resignations honorably, as honorable men. They must be aware that they should leave now, although they did not resign. I am under great pressure by my people to endure and withstand, to thank those who are marked as insufficiently efficient and exhausted men for their service, and to send them away, so that the army and the General Staff can be rejuvenated. Demands have been made to replace Mladic, because he was not here when Krajina fell, etc. I do not think those demands are justified at this moment. However, the others must accept their resignations. After all, Misic was retired three or four times and restored to his position in the army. Consequently, when an honorable officer is sent to another post or relieved from his duty, he must accept that with honor and dignity because he is here to serve his people and not vice-versa. Let nobody be deluded into thinking that will not be realized, because it will.

[Deretic] Historically speaking, do you think it would have been good if the Serb Republic had gotten closer to the United States? If yes, why has it not been done?

[Karadzic] We know what the United States thinks about us. They consider us a free society. They are aware that we did not have a single political trial, not a single execution.... We had nothing that a society in wartime usually has. They know that we opted for free society and market economy, that we are setting the scene for privatization. They are aware of that. Basic institutions in the American society think positively of us. However, they are obliged to look after the Muslims and cannot show what they think about us — in other words, they cannot show goodwill. You know we have been accused of committing war crimes. They will continue to treat us with reservations for a while, use a parking brake, as it were. You know that 'Arafat could not enter the United States because he was pronounced a war criminal, but now he is their dear guest and Clinton is photographed with him whenever they sign an agreement. The time will come when the United States will have good relations with us. Personally, I think it is good that the United States and Russia are not enemies, for we Serbs must not lose our ties with Russia. We must maintain good relations with Russia. And we always had good relations with the United States. England and France also have friendly intentions. As regards England, France, Russia, and Serbia, i.e. Serbhood, there is a germ of a new entente in relation to German interests. In other words, we again fit into those international relations with our old allies and I believe they will also be joined by the United States.

[Deretic] One question is when can the Serb Republic citizens expect elections. The other is whether the Serb Republic leadership, considering the recent events in the Krajina, think that it has lost the confidence of the people, at least of those in the said area.

[Karadzic] We will probably soon have elections, but not as soon as we think, because the international community will try to hinder and delay them, wanting to be the one to say: Now the time has come to hold elections. Many factors of democracy will be involved, but we will definitely have elections next year, there is no doubt about it. Whether that will be in the first six months or the second six months, I do not know.

[Deretic] That will depend on the situation.

[Karadzic] Yes. You know, we are having great difficulties because we are attacked by a far more superior force and defended by nobody but God. Naturally, the ruling party is criticized for all problems and difficulties. At present, whenever something good is done, people do not call the ruling party and commend it for doing a great job. Everyone thinks they deserve the credit, while criticizing the authorities, from municipalities to the government and the assembly. Right now, some people certainly feel frustrated, angry, etc. However, we will ultimately emerge as winners, historically speaking, and I believe that is the best possible achievement any party can wish for. Statehood is the ultimate goal of every nation — there is no greater goal. The Kurds and the Palestinians, as well as other nations that do not have their own state, or the Croats who did not have a state, know that very well. Of course, the entire nation should get the credit, not just the party that leads that nation on the political and the military scene. I think the party will make a few significant moves yet and that the people will know who did what in this war.

[Deretic] If the Serb Democratic Party [SDS] were to lose in the next elections, what would you say would be the main reason for that, or what is the main weakness of the SDS at present?

[Karadzic] I do not believe it will lose. It does not have any opponents and it cannot lose in the elections. I have talked to the people who criticize the party with more or less justification to do so. I told them that they may be right and asked them which party is better than the SDS. Are the Socialists, the Communists, or anyone else better? Then they said that there is no better party for the time being. However, lack of discipline within the party is the basic weakness of the SDS. It is the SDS who attacks itself most. Party officials and bodies expose little, insignificant things, publicly criticize themselves, like masochists. That is also indicative of the degree of democracy within the party. There is no brainwashing, punishment, expelling. We have not expelled anyone from the party except [word indistinct], who was a traitor. Some left of their own accord. Brdja, for instance, whom we like very much, left of his own free will, we would not expel him. What our party will have to work on is intra-party discipline. We are now preparing a new party program that will be adopted by the assembly. We are also preparing something new: a code of behavior. When we get the party to function, from the central committee via executive committee, municipal committee, to local committee, as it did before the elections and before the war, when it was preparing the nation for defense, the Serb Republic is bound to be a stronghold of the SDS in the union of Serb lands or in the Serb lands for all times. Just as the Strauss party always wins the elections in Bavaria, and as long as there is Bavaria, the Strauss party will win the elections. However, only a lively party that is being transformed, rejuvenated all the time, both with regard to its program and personnel, can do that.

[Deretic] You mentioned a new party program. Can you tell us the most important traits that will be its guidelines in the future?

[Karadzic] Our party must have a new program because our main concern when our party was being formed was to stay in Yugoslavia, to defend our nation from massacres, genocide, to defend it from being annexed to NDB-H [Independent State of Bosnia-Herzegovina], and the SDS realized all those goals. During the war — that is, after the elections before the war — a goal has been set that if Bosnia cannot remain in Yugoslavia, we will create our own state within Bosnia. The SDS realized those goals together with the people, for we have many members, many people voted for us and still support us today. However, now that we have our state and when we are entering a new phase in the history of the Serb nation, in the history of statehood of the Serb nation, we must make a new program. We have never thought about women and their place in our state and our society. We had to defend our people from genocide and stay either in Yugoslavia or our own state. Now we have to define the position of women, when women get pensions, how much will they get for the first child and all subsequent children, what benefits will it get. The woman is the pillar of our society. We must decide what to do with farmers, agriculture, find ways to exempt farming from all taxes, for example, in order to have cheap food, for that would also solve the problem of feeding our workers in towns. Farming free of taxes will cut prices on the market. We would not do that only for the farmers, but also for those who buy their products. The question of the model of privatization.... The SDS program must deal with all those questions and it must be adopted by the assembly, and then all our members [words indistinct] will be able to show what we will do in the next four or five years, considering the fact that we have left the first five-year period with enormous capital. It has been five years since we were established. Those five years have seen something that usually happens in a hundred years of a nation's history. So many things have happened in the past five years. For example, 22,000 people were killed in Kozarska Dubica during World War II. In Dubica alone. Five thousand people were killed in Sanski Most in one day. A great number of people were killed in World War II. We were hungry, thirsty, in exile, had diseases, typhoid fever, etc. We have fought in the war for five and a half years, mostly with our own means with some help that we must not fail to mention. We are fighting with our own means and have fewer casualties and less starvation. Our soldiers are better trained, although they do not have all the equipment. Still, they have the minimum and our people are protected and our state is recognized by the whole world. They pronounce its name Republika Srpska. We do not even let them translate its name, etc. Consequently, after those first five years — and every party in the world could only wish for such a historic role, the opportunity to step out of a Bosnian pot with half of Bosnia turned into its own state — we must now be a lively party, face the future. We have had enough of fighting our enemy, now we will fight against our own weaknesses. We must get more civilized, improve the quality of our life, relations in the society, democracy, freedom, production, we must join other Serb states, Europe. We are preparing our program, a very extensive one, but it must also be precise and recognizable enough, so that everyone can tell what the party will do in the next four years.

[Deretic] Why does the opposition act so fiercely, with so much emotional charge, with accusations that are so difficult to disqualify?

[Karadzic] For two reasons. First, every opposition would like to inflict a heavy blow to the ruling party. Second, our opposition knows that we do not arrest our opponents, that we do not send them into exile, etc., and it thinks it can afford to be incorrect and make such accusations. What would you say about a general, for instance, who was constantly drunk, who lost us so much time when he was in command, who did not advance an inch in two years, etc., who spreads rumors that the leadership is terrible? Do you sue him and make him prove it or do we make a star out of him or ignore him? We decided to ignore that. What can you say about an illegal radio station that is broadcast by some military circles — Radio Krajina? If they had asked for a permit, they would probably have been issued one, as did Big Radio, which is a legal station. Instead, they made an illegal radio station and broadcast programs featuring all opponents of the system, disturbing citizens in the middle of a war, calling citizens to organize themselves, as if there is no state, no army in this country. They think that they can now do whatever they want because we are lenient and tolerant. We are lenient and tolerant because we are strong, not because we are afraid to arrest somebody. We are not afraid and if there is legal cause for arresting someone, we would not have a problem with that. However, we feel the people know. And when a drunken, former, retired general asks the people to follow him, people laugh and ask: Follow you to which gin mill? We have a state, an army, organized forces and when people want to defend themselves, they go to their institutions and support those institutions in order to defend themselves. The opposition... Of course it is ridiculous that it should act this way in wartime. We are the only country in the world that allowed the registering of new parties in wartime. Nobody has ever done that. But we have so much self-confidence that people are aware what each of us is doing and that they recognize who is interested in fighting for power and who wants to save the nation, that we indulged ourselves. I think those people and marginal forces that are now fighting for power, regardless of the fact that they could weaken the state, are actually disqualifying themselves. People will remember them and will not vote for them.

[Deretic] You have almost answered the question whether there are valid arguments for everything the opposition says on Radio Krajina. However, if they have no argument, how come they have gone unpunished for spreading lies in the media?

[Karadzic] We could decide to let the public prosecutor institute legal proceedings against the slanderer and make them prove their arguments in court. However, as I said, perhaps we will even decide to sue certain people, but on the whole, I think people will recognize.... People know who engages in black marketeering, who is a war profiteer and who is not. It does not take long to figure out who lives in what way and who does what. People will only disparage themselves.

[Deretic] What do you think about the fact that the interests of the Serb nation from the Serb Republic will be represented at the negotiations by Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, and that his word will be decisive?

[Karadzic] This is a parity delegation. Originally, they wanted to have a 3:2 ratio and we refused that. We agreed to have three representatives each, and that if the outcome of the conference depends on that, to let President Milosevic have the final say during voting. I cannot say, none of us can say that President Milosevic is our opponent. Of course, he is in a very difficult position because his primary goal is to save Yugoslavia and Serbia and to lift the sanctions. We also believe that we saved Serbia fighting this war for three and a half years, keeping Germany at bay and its intentions to break Serbia. The time for breaking Serbia is up. President Milosevic will certainly fight for as much as he can get, for he will have three of our men in his delegation and he will definitely not support our opponents. The only question is how persistent and unbending he will be in fighting for things we can get. That is why we have three of our representatives who will steer him. If the vote turns out to be three against three, for instance, and Milosevic's vote determines whether or not to include a town into our territory, he will bear great responsibility. But I hope he will not work against our interests and cooperate with our delegation. After all, his place in history largely hinges on how much he achieves at those talks.

[Deretic] Could you comment on today's issue of TELEGRAF? There is a headline that says you accepted a map that would give Prijedor, Bosanska Gradiska, and half of Banja Luka to the Croats.

[Karadzic] I have seen it. That is a lie. I think they sometimes ascribe it to some of our people from the Serb Republic, but I do not believe that they said that. There is no map! The only map that exists is the Owen-Stoltenberg map that was adopted by our assembly. You remember what it was like. That map was fairly bearable to us, except regarding Brcko, but we hoped that further talks on Sarajevo would give us a somewhat wider corridor at Brcko. I claim with full responsibility that there is no other map! The people and our soldiers should be told that. There is no map. It has yet to be drawn. It will be presented to the assembly and ratified through a referendum, if we should opt for that. Nobody has drawn any maps so far. Of course, our enemy shows various maps on television and its media in order to weaken our defense. We are aware of that. For the entire three and a half years of war, their television claimed that it was agreed that Ilijas be exchanged. And then an attack on Ilijas would follow in a day or two because they were trying to weaken the resistance of the Ilijas defenders — that is, destroy their motivation to defend the town. There are no maps! We must defend every inch of our territory! The maps will be made public. We will do nothing behind the backs of our people.

[Deretic] About the maps, do we stand a chance of retrieving Kljuc, Sanski Most, Mrkonjic Grad, and part of Drvar, as the hinterland of Banja Luka, by peaceful means — that is, through negotiations? Why should we not cede more territory in eastern Bosnia and some parts of Sarajevo in order to get more compact territory in the Serb Republic?

[Karadzic] We have a good chance of retrieving a sizable part, but when you are exchanging something for something else that is not any good, people start to get angry and ask: Why are you exchanging my area when we managed to defend it, instead of exchanging something that has not been defended? What we will exchange, we will not give for anything concrete, but for a state. Many people said: I defend my village, I am prepared to cede it if we get a state, but I do not want to exchange it for another village. In other words, we must not look at what is exchanged. We will not exchange anything for nothing. We will see to it that we correct the map at the negotiations so that it is good and acceptable. I am positive that we will provide such a hinterland to Banja Luka, which no Muslim town has. For instance, we are much closer to Zenica than they are to us. We are much closer to Tuzla than they are to us. We are much closer to Sarajevo than they are to us. We are much closer to Mostar. We are... We see Mostar, it is within range of our small arms. We are better off than our enemy. Take a look at our enemy: We are literally holding every hill overlooking their towns. And if we manage to regain — and I am convinced we will — important areas in the south in the zone of High Krajina [visoka Krajina] — our delegation was entrusted with that and knows all the variants — then we can say we have accomplished a great deal, although we would have accomplished the most had the Serb Krajina not fallen. Both Grahovo and Glamoc would have been in our hands in that case and so would Knin. But that is a question that cannot be answered by the Army of the Serb Republic or the government of the Serb Republic. The entire Serbhood, expressing solidarity, must answer for that, for only the entire Serbhood could have defended those areas. The town of Grahovo alone with its 8,000 inhabitants could not have defended itself. Somebody had to come to the rescue when it was attacked by such a mighty force.

[Deretic] When will the result of the investigation into several murders in Banja Luka that have harmed this town and all of Serb Republic be revealed, and who is attacking the vehicles of international humanitarian organizations?

[Karadzic] Brane Picanac, a very fine fellow, is head of the security center, but he is always on the front line. Other members of the Interior Ministry — almost as much as 90 percent of them — are constantly engaged in fighting. Nevertheless, we are very effective in investigating crimes, both in Banja Luka and Prijedor, as well as in other centers. I hope that they will shed some light on every crime. Nobody has a right to take another's life, regardless of religion, nation, etc. We, the Serbs, must attain such security that those who remain with us accept the Serb state, Serb culture, Serb tradition, and are not enemies of the Serbs. We must protect those people. We must especially protect soldiers of other nationalities who stayed on and fought alongside our soldiers. They, too, must be given credit for this state. We must treat them absolutely equally. We must find and punish those who committed those murders.

On the other hand, there is a great danger that somebody is purposely pouncing on the UNHCR. Two vehicles were attacked in one day: at Foca, in Sarajevo, here, in the zone of Prijedor, Banja Luka.... As if someone is trying to spoil our good relations with the international community. We must be aware that we receive enormous help from the international community, that the UNHCR is planning to invest about 1 billion German marks to repair houses in the zone of our Krajina. That will all stop if those attacks on the UNHCR continue. I will soon meet with Mrs. (Walker) to explain that this is not our policy, that those were criminals, and that every country has them. We have already found some vehicles in Foca and near Sarajevo and they will be returned with an apology. Criminals will be brought to justice. With regard to this matter, too, the entire nation must cooperate and help us, and help the police to establish law and order. Those who attack the UNHCR and the international community are against this nation. They break our ties with foreign countries. The Serbs have never had any problems with foreigners. Foreigners are welcome here, if they are not our enemy. We even treat our enemies and spies in a civilized manner. We must defend ourselves against espionage, but not by arrogance or criminal behavior. This could directly damage us. The arrogance of certain commanders has cost us in the past three and a half years over 30,000 metric tons of food. They simply would not let a convoy pass without any reason whatsoever. If a convoy does not reach the Muslims, then it does not reach the Serbs either. This caused great economic damage, and we will not allow that.

[Deretic] So you think that only criminals are behind those attacks on UNHCR vehicles?

[Karadzic] I am positive. If those attacks are intentional and concerted, that is also a crime, but that is also a crime against one's own nation.

[Deretic] Here is a question that regards us as well. Do you not think that the state-owned media no longer have their primary function?

[Karadzic] I do not think so. State-owned media have always had a special obligation in their program scheme. For instance, the private Big Radio has fewer obligations and can devote more time to music, etc., and people like that. Our radio and television must also be as amusing and as attractive as possible, but they have obligations to fulfill that regard education, information, and other domains. I believe we will soon establish a unified system, both for radio and television. It is up to you to advance. Tell the viewers whether you are free to do so, whether you are bothered by the state, whether you are replaced, terrorized, etc. I think journalists and correspondents are free people in this country. Our viewers must be aware that the state-owned media have more obligations with regard to spreading information than the private media, which can devote all their time to pleasing their audience.

[Deretic] Could you comment on a statement by General Lisica broadcast on Radio Krajina and Belgrade Telegraf?

[Karadzic] Gen. Lisica should be a bit more honorable and have more dignity. Otherwise, all that should be proven in court and he would surely lose in court. It is a shame that a general whose mistakes we have tolerated for a long time and whom we promoted should spread slander, both about the nation and the leadership, and to hope that he should again be put in command. That is out of the question.

[Deretic] Why are changes in the government and the army being made now at the most crucial time for the Serb Republic? Will anybody be held accountable?

[Karadzic] I demanded that both civilian and military institutions launch investigations...

[Deretic] Allow me to interrupt. I must pose another question: Is this government doomed to be replaced or offer its resignation?

[Karadzic] The government is the most sensible segment of a society because they execute.... Once his term is over, the prime minister will not be more reputable than before his term. That reputation withers away not due to their fault. They hold that kind of a position, a very difficult one. You do a man a disservice when you propose him as prime minister. When will we make changes if not now? I tried to make changes earlier and people have witnessed that by doing that, I showed that something is wrong in the organization of our army, that there are enormous weaknesses that must be overcome. We lost 12 towns! People in charge must have the decency to resign immediately and to be feel shame as long as they live! Who is responsible? All of us, I say. The Union of Serb Sisters [Kolo srpskih sestara] will forgive me, I hope. All of us except them are responsible, but we are not all equally responsible. The Union of Serb Sisters is the least responsible. Commands are first on the list, for they are in charge of the army. Some people said that municipality presidents sold their municipality. How can a president sell his municipality if not through commanders? Some say that municipality presidents lead people out and that is why the municipality was lost. That is also wrong. In most cases, in most municipalities, both the leadership and the people left after the army. What happened at every fall? One or two units abandoned their positions without authorization and thus committed the most serious crime against their people and their state. Only after they left did people follow. Some have even never managed to get out. Consequently, what better time to make changes now that our territory is so scattered? I think those individuals should not have waited for me to replace them. They should have taken one look in the mirror, admit their responsibility, and be responsible enough to offer their resignation, to let some younger people come to their positions, so that solutions could be find in order to stop that. [passage omitted]

[Deretic] Students want to know more about the demobilization of students.

[Karadzic] We have always wanted to keep students out of the war in the first place, because they are the future of our country, our nation. However, circumstances were such that demands were made for mobilization and we had to yield to those demands. I talked to the minister. He was the one to make that decision, issued that order, and I hope that students will be demobilized as planned, little by little. I do not know exactly when this process will end. Commanders tell me that students are a very valuable part of their brigades. They are the stabilizing element of their brigades. They are intelligent and prevent the spreading of rumors. They appreciate the effort of our authorities, they know what is the value of the state. Students are the flower of our army. I think we did much better this time. Last time we were proposed to form student brigades and that was not good. We no longer have those brigades and students are interspersed among other soldiers, which produced good results. Our goal is to send students back to their homes as soon as possible. I think commanders of corps must gradually enable that so that the loss of such high-quality soldiers is not a shock. I hope this cease-fire will hold so that they will no longer be mobilized.

[Deretic] What rights are granted to refugees from the Republic of Serb Krajina and when will their right be equated to those of other citizens in the Serb Republic?

[Karadzic] Unfortunately, I do not meet with President Martic as often as I would like to, as I am often away on business. We agreed that people from RSK be given refugee status because they were given some privileges by the international community. [sentence as heard] However, the moment this war is over and when we turn toward ourselves, when we start rebuilding our country, I would like to give the RSK refugees the same status as our refugees. They should be helped to acquire property again and to be citizens of the Serb Republic. I think that those who went to Serbia and could not prosper or be happy there should also return. They should not have left in the first place, because here we have a new territory and we have a right to distribute property among those refugees, for they left so much of their own property on the other side. Eventually, there will be some kind of redistribution of property among those countries, so that we will be able to satisfy those people as well because they, too, are Serbs and our citizens.

[Deretic] Several callers wanted you to comment on inflated prices and salaries that have been stagnant for the past year and a half, and tell us why soup kitchens were not opened to help out those who do not have anything to eat.

[Karadzic] There are soup kitchens in some places. The authorities and the ruling party must cooperate with the Red Cross. We do not know exactly who exactly controls the Red Cross. We must help it play its role. Soup kitchens must be established where they are needed. We do not control prices, except for some products, because there would not be those products, as they would have to be bought in Yugoslavia and smuggled into the country. The blockade at the Drina River resulted in the rise of prices most of all. Furthermore, there is a flow of people who no longer have their products. [sentence as heard] We have lost a lot of the territory where people had their wheat, their produce, and demand could be met. Now there is suddenly more demand because we now have more people, both from the RSK and our Krajina, and that led to the increase of prices. However, the moment the blockade at the Drina is lifted, we expect that prices will become stabilized and that they will even decrease. [passage omitted]

[Deretic] What steps will be taken against rich inhabitants of Prijedor who left the town when it had to be defended? I guess the question also refers to other towns.

[Karadzic] I think deserters must be punished according to the law. It is a shame to abandon defense lines some 18-20 kilometers away from Prijedor. Nobody abandoned the Doboj defense lines and they are only some 3 or 4 kilometers away. People are even coming back. I cannot understand how anyone can abandon his or her home town and that they are not motivated to defend their town, that somebody else must defend it, that the poor and not the rich must remain to defend it. Though I think those are isolated cases. At any rate, the people must criticize, if not ostracize, those who are prepared to pack their belongings and take to their heels instead of defending their town. All of us could have run away and we would not have Serb Herzegovina, old Herzegovina, the Sarajevo municipalities, Sekovici, Zvornik, which is a front-line town, Brcko, you know how much shelling it endured, Serb Posavina, Doboj, Ozren. There is no justification for that, that is intolerable. Police should put an end to that. Izetbegovic forbade citizens to leave Sarajevo, otherwise it would have fallen into our hands.

[Deretic] What do you mean by access to the sea for the Serb Republic? Which part of the sea are you referring to?

[Karadzic] We hoped that the United Serb Republic would have two seas: one at Karin, the other down at Prevlaka. We have a right to half of Neum. If Croatia does not want to be cut into pieces, it will have to give us the area all the way to Prevlaka — that is, the area from Cavtat to Prevlaka, Konavli. We will haggle about how much we will get, but we will relinquish our right to Neum and we are also prepared to give some territory in the hinterland of Dubrovnik. Croatia has a vested interest in giving the Serb Republic access to the sea. We will cede much more territory than we will get. In turn, Dubrovnik will be much safer for tourism, etc. Consequently, the Croats would not be giving anything away. It is in their interest that we be given access to the sea in this way. That is why we will get that by political means, because that is in the interest of Croatia.

[Deretic] What does it really mean when you say that we have a right to a part of Neum?

[Karadzic] You see, former Bosnia-Herzegovina is divided according to a 51:49 ratio — that is, 49 percent of the coast at Neum belongs to us. We have a right to that, for that was the coast of former Bosnia-Herzegovina. But we know Croatia does not want to see its territory dismembered. We will, therefore, be prepared to be satisfied with that.... In addition to that part at Neum, we are prepared to give more hinterland to Dubrovnik. Consequently, that is in Croatia's best interest and I believe we will resolve that.

[Deretic] Is there a chance that we will get the Bocac hydroelectric power plant, considering its enormous importance?

[Karadzic] It is a great shame that we lost Jajce I and Jajce II, and especially Bocac. Somebody is responsible for that, because they could have been defended, but I hope — I am convinced — that Bocac will again be ours because we will demand that territory in the south, as those are purely Serb territories. I believe we will get it back for the international community guarantees that justice will be done.

[Deretic] Why was Banja Luka not declared our capital when it actually is one?

[Karadzic] You see, capitals of many countries are actually small towns — take Bijeljina, for example. We held a party meeting there. They want to get rid of whatever republican institutions they have there, because wherever you have government, you have strict control. In other words, the largest city does not necessarily have to be our capital. We still have not declared Banja Luka our capital because we are not fighting for Banja Luka either by political or military means — although the enemy has unfortunately come very close to its borders — but we are fighting for Sarajevo. In that political fight, we must preserve the Serb part of Sarajevo and legalize it for our state. Later on, it will be easy to decide otherwise. After all, we will have to decentralize government institutions afterwards and make detatchments [detasman] so that people would not have to travel from Pale to Banja Luka or from Banja Luka to Pale. The government must be easily accessible to all. The issue of capital is not so important to us as it is for our enemy. [indistinct passage omitted]

[Deretic] When will the payment system with the FRY be reestablished, and when will the blockade on the Drina River be lifted?

[Karadzic] I discussed that with President Milosevic today. All technical and financial preparations have already been made. I hope that will happen very soon and that the country will immediately feel it. We will immediately have more cash because our traders exported all our cash to the FRY and that is why we have to issue checks for salaries. I hope that will happen very soon. I even asked Holbrooke in the presence of President Milosevic: Why do you not lift the sanctions now that we have returned to the peace process? He replied: Sorry, but that is up to the two of you to solve, we have nothing against that. And I think President Milosevic is seriously working on that. We said that when our deputies from Krajina were here. Sanctions on the Drina only benefit smugglers, those here and in the FRY. Only smugglers, various profiteers that evade taxes can benefit from that. Once the sanctions are lifted and when the state assumes control of the flow of capital and goods, the state and every man in our country will feel that improvement and smugglers will be at a loss.

[Deretic] What do you think about the deployment of multinational forces once the accord is signed?

[Karadzic] Some forces will probably have to be deployed, because international powers cannot guarantee that the war will end. We will accept only the deployment along separation lines and only units from friendly countries: Russia, Great Britain, and France to some extent. We will not have forces from other countries on our territory. I would like the United States to give us a reason to consider it a friendly country. However, we will not allow forces from other countries to be deployed on our territory, nor any kind of mandate or any kind of presence except along the separation line.

[Deretic] Why has the international community not declared a single occupied Serb town a protected zone?

[Karadzic] Because it did not want to protect them. Because it ordered the Muslims and the Croats to conquer as much as they could, and because the behavior of the international community was unjust.

[Deretic] What is the status of the RSK soldiers who are actively involved in the defense of the Serb Republic?

[Karadzic] The same as all our soldiers in the Serb Republic, regardless of religion and nationality. We consider RSK citizens our citizens. Whoever wants to stay here is welcome to do so and will be treated equally.

[Deretic] Will FRY citizens that happened to be in this area be allowed to return to the FRY? This question is a bit vague.

[Karadzic] They will, if that is what they want, but I hope that the situation here will be so good that they will want to come here.

[Deretic] Will Mrkonjic Grad be returned by diplomatic means, and what lies ahead for refugees?

[Karadzic] I am almost positive it will. I deeply regret the loss of Mrkonjic Grad and Sanski Most. In spite of our counteroffensive and our initiative, some units have again proven to be a weak link and those two towns were lost. I believe we will get Mrkonjic Grad back.

[Deretic] I know it is difficult for you to answer all these questions without a break, but there are a few questions left.

[Karadzic] Go ahead.

[Deretic] Has the time come for you to thank politicians, army officials, party members, directors of firms who gained 5-30 kilograms, as people say, for their services?

[Karadzic] We will certainly make some changes even within the party.

[Deretic] Another similar question: When will you check out the SDS?

[Karadzic] Many people compromised their reputation. Some have never tarnished their reputation but the people got tired of them. People simply want to see new, fresh faces and the party will have to be rejuvenated. As regards officers, many of them are honorable men. Some of those honorable officers are very capable, some are incapable. We must thank the latter for their services, we must not declare them traitors. They simply do not have the capability that is required. Education is one thing, talent for leading an army is another. We will thank them for their services. Many have been very harmful to our society and our state. There are elements of a power struggle. You will see that a number of officers will emerge at the elections and compete for power. You will then see that they contributed to the defamation of authorities during the war. There is a small number of them, but it is very bad to poison souls of soldiers who devoted his time to creating this state and this country. They tell them that they do not have boots because the government is no good. That is not true; they should blame the blockade on the Drina, lack of economy, numerous enemies. Never did a single country fight a war without wartime credit, as we did. Nobody has the formal possibility of giving us a loan. We will also thank those officers for their services. Quite a few young men, soldiers, officers, non-commissioned officers have grown into great and skillful strategists. Consequently, we will let some fresh air in that domain as well.

Of course, we will also change the government. This is our fourth government. Some ministers have remained from the first government and will probably stay on because they do a very good job. We have created a high-quality government by sifting through our personnel. Some ministers will be replaced if it turns out that they are not skillful enough. However, it is not easy for a government to work under sanctions. There is no way of knowing what it could have done under different circumstances. Kozic resigned. He is a member of the central committee and we never have problems with SDS members. They always accept our suggestions. He left to strengthen Krajina, although there were two vice presidents in Krajina, two deputy prime ministers, and seven ministers. But he felt that it would perhaps be good, now that Krajina is in danger, that the government is lead by a man from Krajina who could do more to help it recover.

[Deretic] If the peace process should proceed as planned, when can we expect the demobilization of conscripts?

[Karadzic] Unfortunately, we cannot have complete demobilization until Germany and Turkey are demobilized and demilitarized. I have not mentioned our neighbors, but Germany and Turkey as the patrons of our enemies. We will, however, carry out gradual demobilization once we have stabilized our borders and we will try to make a professional army, have some 45,000 to 55,000 professional soldiers, and keep the rest as reserve forces. That is our plan. Those will be splendid brigades with wonderful, professional commanders. The rest will remain in the reserves and will be called up only in case of war. Later on, we will reduce the number of professional soldiers depending on our strength, because the loans of the international community will hinge on budget cuts. Nobody will let the Serb Republic be a military super power. Europe is also asked to reduce its armed forces if they do not intend to wage a war against somebody. The moment we get acceptable borders and international guarantees, we will not have ambitions to conquer other territory. We must build our own home and have such an army and a police that can defend that home. As regards the police, we will have to have professional, anti-terrorist units because we expect that Islamic fanatics will begin launching terrorist attacks on our territory, just like in Israel. We will have to have professional units to prevent those terrorist actions.

[Deretic] How come Serb Sarajevo, which was bravely defended by the inhabitants of Krajina, could be defended, while some units of the Eastern Bosnian Corps abandoned their defense lines on the western Krajina front?

[Karadzic] Serb Sarajevo began fighting on 5 April 1992 and has never stopped fighting. People and soldiers are so well trained, trenches are 50 meters apart. You just stick your nose out and you are dead. Take the Jewish cemetery, for instance. Thousands and thousands of Muslims were killed there. Until November 1992, 12,000 soldiers were killed in the city of Sarajevo alone. Very few civilians were killed in Sarajevo. Instead, 12,000 soldiers were killed because they assaulted Serb defense lines that were very well fortified at that time.

[Deretic] You are talking about Muslim soldiers.

[Karadzic] I am talking about 12,000 Muslim soldiers who were killed attacking Serb defense lines. So far, I think the grand total is about 18,000 Muslim soldiers that were killed in the city of Sarajevo. They kept us alert on the outer ring as well, and we could never get complacent and that is what kept it going. NATO planned that the Serbs would abandon Sarajevo. However, the Serbs were obeying orders and went down into shelters. After two or three thousand bombs rained down, when the jets were gone, the Serbs came out of their shelters smiling. They would not move. Our problem is the fact that in some areas, people are not accustomed to having shells rain down on their houses. On the other hand, I must say that a huge number of mortars landed on Krajina. As did on Sarajevo, indeed, but Krajina was targeted by everyone: by rapid reaction forces, the Croatian Army with modern weapons that it purchased, and the Muslims. And that is one of the reasons. I am not trying to justify our weaknesses. Quite the contrary, I am determined to eradicate them, even at the cost of replacing I do not know how many officers. We must say that the inhabitants of Krajina are the pride of the Serb nation and that they have always been great soldiers, but they were faced with an enormous force. Take Dubica, for instance. A great force attacked Dubica, over 200 Croats were killed and found in the river and on the other side. About 1,200 of them attacked Dubica when the defenders of Dubica prevented them from establishing a bridgehead. Croatian reports say that over 20 percent of them were killed there. Consequently, the Krajina inhabitants are great soldiers, even when shells are raining down on them. Another important thing is that people trust their commander and leadership and they will stay on. It is imperative that people stay in every village and town that is being shelled to protect themselves. [passage omitted]

[Deretic] And the final question — we will have to leave out a couple of answers that you answered indirectly — will the new government do anything to improve the spreading of information, especially regarding the presentation of truth about our plight in the world?

[Karadzic] I hope it will. We have good journalists, free journalists in the media. Our infrastructure was destroyed, etc. GLAS is a good newspaper, the new team is quite good, but not every citizen can read GLAS.

[Deretic] There is not enough paper.

[Karadzic] A shortage of paper, poor salaries, etc., but they nevertheless do a good job. However, as regards the world, it does not want to hear our truth. We had foreign journalists here, and gave them stories worth the Pulitzer Prize, but they were not interested. They came here to defame the Serbs, looking for such stories. I must tell our audience that it is wrong to think that their governments are under pressure by their media. Their media have completely surrounded the government. And when the editor in chief says: Put pressure on the Serbs, publish stories about their guilt, journalists obey. Watching CNN, Sky News, we can predict what the attitude of the international community will be toward us in the next period. Hopefully, when the war is over.... Some media are even now talking about sins of the international community with regard to us and tell the truth about Markale I and Markale II, about many other cases when we were punished or reprimanded. We have a growing number of friends. Some people write books. (Patric Besson) has recently written one, and is now writing another one. (Merlinaux), a famous Frenchman... Europe's finest intellectuals have taken us under their wing, having seen what we went through in the past three and a half years, that we were crucified like Jesus Christ our Lord, that we were up against an immense force, that everybody was against us at one point, even major forces in our mother country. We now have good relations with the official Serbia and Yugoslavia, with a good part of opposition, too. But we do not understand the point of those incorrect, vile attacks against the stability of the Serb Republic, of bombastic headlines that make no sense, that are not true, etc. But we will weather that. I hope that the international community, our mother country, and our nation will eventually learn the truth.

[Deretic] In conclusion, a question that our callers did not pose, but a very topical one: the elections in Croatia. Do you think there will be some changes after the elections and what could happen in Sector East, as they call it?

[Karadzic] I think it would be absolutely irrational if Tudjman attacked Sector East now. The Croats would surely get a good beating in that case, spoil the results of "Storm" and "Flash," and the Croatian Democratic Community [HDZ] would get fewer votes. However, our soldiers must be prepared for that variant, too. I believe the HDZ will take the elections by storm because of the people's mentality and because it exploited everything that happened, because it ascribed it all to itself. After all, that is not a minor achievement — they were fighting for their own state for 900 years. The HDZ, as a nation-building party, will certainly win the elections. The HDZ could have gotten a state in a much more simple manner. It would perhaps be a little different with the accord with the Serbs, but Krajina remains an unsolved question and that could lead to more wars in the future between us and Croatia.

[Deretic] Do you think the HDZ will change its strategy?

[Karadzic] I do not think so. I think they are now very arrogant and that will be the source of their mistakes. We are a totally different party. We did not allow any of our members to get rich, and none of them got rich. Our party will not have an advantage in the process of privatization. The HDZ seems to have bought everything the Croatian state owned. As the Gospel says, those who want to be the first among the Serbs must serve us. That is how things go among the Serbs. The Serbs will not give power to those who will profit from it. They give power to those who will toil, sacrifice themselves.... And the Serbs are right. They must demand that their leaders serve the people, lead the way, be self- sacrificing. I cannot ask the SDS members to keep silent when they are attacked, to endure, to sacrifice themselves, because they ask me how long they must endure that. As long as you want to serve your people, I tell them. You can get rich when you run a kebab joint, but you will not get rich serving the people. And this is where the HDZ is bound to go wrong, but they will win these elections. However, later on, when they do not have the Serbs as their enemy, I hope a democratic spectrum will emerge in Croatia and make a difference.

[Deretic] We have one more question left that you have answered before: Will Banja Luka remain in the Serb Republic, or will it be exchanged for Tuzla?

[Karadzic] For heaven's sake, that is out of the question. I do not think I should swear to that. I know some officials who sent their children abroad, and are now even sending their wives away.... I brought my wife here, and if we were ever surrounded, God forbid, I would not move from here. The inhabitants of Banja Luka can defend Banja Luka. Moreover, Banja Luka must be defended by the entire country, for it is the pearl of the Serb nation, one of its most beautiful towns. They could even offer to exchange Constantinople, we would not accept that. We will never give them Prijedor, Bosanski Novi, Banja Luka. Sanski Most, Mrkonjic Grad, Kljuc, etc. must be given back. Do not listen to our enemies! Banja Luka is a Serb town and will remain ours. Both our state and army is working on that.

[Deretic] I thank you, Mr. President, on behalf of the viewers of Serb Radio Television.

Karadzic Outlines Objectives

AU2710204895 Banja Luka Srpska Televizija in Serbo-Croatian 1930 GMT 26 Oct 95

[Report by Vlado Slijepcevic]

[FBIS Translated Text] Serb Republic President Radovan Karadzic attended a session of the municipal committee of the Banja Luka Serb Democratic Party [SDS].

[Slijepcevic] Before drawing up an agenda, Serb Republic President Radovan Karadzic informed the members of the municipal committee of the Banja Luka SDS about the talks between the state leadership and intellectuals from Serb lands which were held in Bijeljina last Monday [23 October]. Our state delegation is preparing for the upcoming peace talks.

[Begin Karadzic recording] Our delegation, which will go to Ohio for the talks, is composed of Krajisnik, Koljevic, Buha, and a team of experts. For that meeting, we mostly simulated the talks. We tried to predict every possible situation, and talked about what we must necessarily get with regard to statehood or the degree of independence, relations in the union, as well as with regard to geography, i.e. maps. Our delegation undertook — and so did the FRY part of the delegation, headed by President Milosevic — to demand that our towns in the western part of the republic, i.e. the so-called high Krajina, be given back to us at all costs. Even at the cost of making certain concessions toward central Bosnia, but we must get back as much as we can. It has been made clear that these prominently Serb areas, especially those which always had an almost 100-percent Serb majority, will not be relinquished, and we must not accept the results of the aggression in the wake of NATO air strikes and Croatia's involvement in the war. [end recording]

[Slijepcevic] All of us have agreed that, in the course of negotiating process, national interest, the sovereignty of the Serb Republic must take absolute priority. Deputies insisted on that at the latest assembly session held in Bijeljina. The session of the Banja Luka SDS municipal committee continued behind closed doors.

Assembly Head 'Optimistic'

AU2710205495 Banja Luka Srpska Televizija in Serbo-Croatian 1930 GMT 26 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] According to Momcilo Krajisnik, chairman of the Serb Republic National Assembly, the talks to be held in Dayton, Ohio stand a better chance of establishing peace in former Bosnia-Herzegovina than all the previous peace talks that failed to produce results. We are optimistic, although we have misgivings about the negotiations as long as there is a realistic chance of Croatia attacking eastern Slavonia, which would sabotage the peace process, warned Krajisnik. In the framework of numerous talks with the leadership of Serbia and the representatives of the FRY delegation, we have recently developed a joint strategy to achieve as much as possible in the peace process, emphasized Momcilo Krajisnik, chairman of the Serb Republic National Assembly.

Peace Never Closer

LD2910152495 Belgrade SRNA in Serbo-Croatian 1410 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Kragujevac, 29 Oct (SRNA) — Nikola Koljevic, vice president of the Serb Republic, and People's Assembly President Momcilo Krajisnik have expressed optimism with regard to the success of the forthcoming talks on Bosnia in Dayton, and said that peace has never been closer than now with the U.S. peace initiative.

Speaking in the "Hallmark of the Times" program of Kragujevac radio, Assembly President Krajisnik said that "optimism is based on the fact that the United States has always obstructed, or rather helped the Muslims to obstruct the agreements."

"However, there are no longer any such obstructions to this agreement, and the United States as a leading power will not allow its initiative to fail," decalred Krajisnik, who will be leading the Serb Republic part of the joint FRY-Serb Republic delegation.

In the same program Vice President Koljevic said that what is crucial for the success of the talks is the fact that "all big powers, led by the United States," want peace.

He believes that the peace must be just, as an unjust peace would only increase the risk of a renewed war.

"The solution will lie in a compromise, equally painful for all sides," Koljevic said.

Krajisnik thinks there will be "difficult moments, perhaps even surprises at the talks, or even attempts to take things back to square one." In his opinion everything should be resolved.

He added that the Serb side is setting off with clean intentions and that a solution will be found if international mediators and the other side adopt the same approach.

Commenting on the latest demands by the Muslim government, both Serb Republic officials compared the Muslim side with "a spoiled child setting its own conditions," and concluded that the task of the international community is to "curb" it.

Krajisnik said the Muslims are now in a state of euphoria, trying to dictate the conditions, that after certain military successes they are no longer realistic. He added that many statements by their representatives are intended for the domestic political scene.

"What is realistic is that those who believe that the Serbs are handicapped are in fact deceived, and they will have to make concessions. We shall accept that which we have pledged to accept, nothing less than the minimum Serb demands," said Krajisnik.

Krajisnik also said that stands have been coordinated with FRY representatives, and that there are no serious differences.

"It is a great bonus for the Serb people to have a joint delegation. I am convinced that we are much more harmonious than ever. The previous rift has tought the Serbian bloc to prepare a joint approach and thus bring the Serbs peace, unity, and a state," Krajisnik said.

Hoping for 'Compromise'

AU2910181895 Paris AFP in English 1735 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Belgrade, Oct 29 (AFP) — Senior Bosnian Serb officials headed for peace talks beginning Wednesday [1 November] in the United States have said they are hoping for "a compromise" settlement that will end fighting in their war-torn country.

"The U.S. will not permit its initiative to fail" even if, in the past, "it has consistently helped the Moslems to block accords," said Momcilo Krajisnik, head of the Bosnian Serb contingent of the Serbian delegation headed by Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic.

Serbia is representing the Bosnian Serbs at the peace talks due to be held at a military base near Dayton, Ohio.

Krajisnik said he was "optimistic" but acknowledged that the negotiations were likely to be "difficult," in a radio interview here.

"Those who think that the Serbs will be handicapped and that they will have to give in are wrong," Krajisnik added.

"We will accept exactly that which we have undertaken, but we will not accept anything that is inconsistent with the bottom-line interests of Serbs," he said.

Nikola Koljevic, another member of the Bosnian Serb delegation, suggested that "the solution will consist of a compromise that will be equally painful for all sides."

Serb Patriotic Front Disputes RS Prime Minister

AU2710120695 Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 26 Oct 95 p 4

[Report by M. Maric: "Disputed Appointments"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Banja Luka — The Patriotic Front of [Bosnian] Krajina yesterday expressed its dissatisfaction over the appointment of Rajko Kasagic as Serb Republic [Serb-held entity in Bosnia-Herzegovina] prime minister-designate, particularly condemning the practice of melding together the legislative and executive authorities, which relieves both of responsibility for the situation in the state, and places the republic in the club of democratically undeveloped societies and political systems.

"Our bitterness is all the greater because Mr. Kasagic, as chairman of the Banja Luka executive committee, was against it being proclaimed the capital, and because he has been appointed prime minister-designate as an extreme proponent of the anti-Krajina tendency. Does this mean that one can have political success in the Serb Republic only through a negative attitude toward Krajina?" reads the statement by the Patriotic Front of Krajina.

At the same time the Patriotic Front regards it as illegal and unprincipled to appoint Vladimir Lukic, former Serb

Republic prime minister, to the expert team for the peace negotiations in the United States, as he has been publicly exposed as having taken part in criminal activities, for which he should be held accountable before the law. Because of these activities, he could be used against the interests of Krajina.

The Patriotic Front is satisfied that its activities have had a positive impact on opening Banja Luka and the Serb Republic to the free movement of citizens. The Patriotic Front is also pleased about the cancellation of the order issued by Information Minister Miroslav Toholj in the interim government on censorship and the ban on the work of all radio stations except the state one.

Izetbegovic Favors Expansion of Ties With Iran

LD3010091695 Tehran IRNA in English
0605 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Sarajevo, Oct. 30, IRNA — Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic, in a meeting here Sunday with the Iranian ambassador to Bosnia-Herzegovina, Mohammad Ibrahim Taherian, called for further expanding and strengthening relations between the two countries.

He also praised the Islamic Republic of Iran for extending humanitarian assistance to the oppressed people of Bosnia.

In the meeting, the two sides also reviewed the latest developments in the Balkan region as well as the upcoming visit of the Bosnian president to Iran.

Meanwhile, in another meeting with the Iranian ambassador in Sarajevo, the executive body of the Bosnian Islamic Party on Saturday termed the peace plan of the Western Contact Group as a "loss" to their country.

The executive body noted that the measures taken by the Western Contact Group as a plot for dividing the Republic of the Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Referring to the Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign policy, Taherian briefed the group about Iranian views on the Bosnian problems.

Tudjman, HDZ Renew Manate in 29 Oct Elections

Elections 'Generally Free and Fair'

AU3010130595 Paris AFP in English
1241 GMT 30 Oct 95

[By Peter Cunliffe-Jones]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Zagreb, Oct 30 (AFP)—Croatian President Franjo Tudjman's rightwing ruling party appeared to have won a renewed mandate Monday for its strongly nationalist policies, strengthening Tudjman's hand as he prepares for U.S.-sponsored Yugoslav peace talks.

Tudjman's Croatian Democratic Community (HDZ), which steered Croatia to independence in 1991 and defeated Serb rebels in two regions earlier this year, won 44.22 percent of the vote in the parliamentary polls after votes from two thirds of polling stations were counted, the electoral commission said.

The HDZ "picked up votes for its hardline stance on the Serbs," a western diplomat here told AFP Monday.

Tudjman, who dominated the election campaign, threatened at a final election rally Friday, to retake the last scrap of Serb-held land in Croatia, the Eastern Slavonia region, by force by December if talks over its peaceful reintegration fail.

However despite its strong campaign the HDZ did not appear to have enough votes for the two-thirds majority of seats it had set itself as an objective, analysts here said.

A two-thirds majority would have enabled the HDZ to change the constitution, increasing the powers of the president and pushing through changes to the country's boundaries and ethnic makeup.

On the votes counted, it appeared that the closest runner-up to the HDZ was a coalition led by the Peasant Party (HSS) which picked up 18.58 percent of the votes, followed by the Social Liberals (HSLS) on 11.95 percent and the former communist SDP on 9:08 percent while a collection of minor parties accounted for the other votes.

Results for the parties for Serb and Hungarian minorities were not immediately available.

Tudjman speaking in the early hours of Monday described the result as a "convincing" victory.

The president however cancelled a planned press conference which was to have been held at midday and officials could not say when or if it would be rearranged. Observers expect the HDZ's final tally to rise as more votes from the four million strong ethnic Croat disapora around the world come in.

The opposition has charged the HDZ with rigging the results of the elections by pushing rule changes through parliament in September before the last parliament, giving the vote to some 400,000 ethnic Croats knowing they would vote for the ruling party.

They have also accused Tudjman, who was not himself a candidate in the elections, of abusing his presidential position by leading the HDZ campaign and controlling wall-to-wall favourable coverage in the largely state-run media.

And the number of seats guaranteed for the minority Serbs were cut from 13 in the last parliament to three in the new one.

International observers Monday critised the media bias, the disapora vote and the reduction of seats guaranteed for the Serb minority, but said the polls were otherwise generally "free and fair."

Tudjman is considered more popular than his party which is accused of giving jobs and rich pickings in the country's privatisation programme to HDZ members and their families.

"Tudjman is the party's strongest asset," a western diplomat said last week. Tudjman himself has said: "Without me, the HDZ is nothing."

Unemployment is high in Croatia—around 17 percent on official figures—and the effect of hyper-inflation in 1992 and 1993 has pushed many things beyond the reach of those on average wages.

Full unofficial results are expected to be announced later Monday with the final official results and aportioning of seats—a complicated procedure under the mixed voting system—not due until Friday.

Estimated turnout was given Sunday as 50.17 percent.

Tudjman Welcomes 'Convincing Victory'

LD3010090895 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network
in Serbo-Croatian 0200 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] [Correspondent] Sanja Cota reporting from the electoral HQS of the Croatian Democratic Union in Zagreb:

Immediately after midnight [2300 GMT] Croatian President Franjo Tudjman arrived in the HQS and, together with HDZ deputy chairmen and other party leaders, listened to the preliminary, unofficial results. On the basis of the incomplete results President Tudjman expressed the conviction that HDZ was winning again:

[Begin Tudjman recording] These partial results speak about the convincing victory for the HDZ. Final results will be even more convincing. Therefore, what we modestly predicted is going to materialize. [end recording]

[Correspondent] The Croatian president also spoke about some new people in the leadership, but did not reveal their names:

[Begin Tudjman recording] There will be new people, including ladies. [end recording]

[Correspondent] Other HDZ leaders said that final results would probably bring a two-thirds majority to the HDZ.

'No Significant Difficulties'

LD2910144195 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Krunislav Olujic, the chairman of the electoral commission of the Republic of Croatia, has held a news conference and announced the turnout in the elections for the Chamber of Deputies by 1100 [1000 GMT]. Jasenka Dudic has a report:

[Dudic] According to reports received from 1,907 polling stations, which cover 1,314,980 voters, 312,021 people—or 23.73 percent of the electorate—voted by 1100. [passage omitted]

The chairman of the electoral commission, Krunislav Olujic, said among other things:

[Begin Olujic recording] I can say with personal pleasure that we are receiving reports by phone and fax from electoral commissions in electoral units which say that the elections for the deputies to the Chamber of Deputies of the Croatian assembly are proceeding in perfect order. There are no significant difficulties in implementing the electoral law. [end recording]

[Dudic] When we were informed about the general alert in Dubrovnik, Olujic said:

[Begin Olujic recording] The electoral commission of the Republic of Croatia informed the electoral commission chairman of the electoral unit with the seat in Dubrovnik about it, and they decided that the elections for the deputies in that electoral unit would continue. All polling stations in the Dubrovnik electoral unit number 22 are open and will stay open until 1900. [end recording]

[Dudic] Olujic said that there were minor problems with voting for members of national minorities—especially Serbs—which he saw for himself when he toured polling stations in Zagreb.

We pointed to the electoral committees and electoral commissions in electoral units that they must implement guideline 11 issued by the Croatian electoral commission on the voting for minorities. Under the guideline, the members of minorities vote for the national list [drzavna lista] and for the minorities' candidates, or if they want, for the national list and the candidates in the electoral unit in which they live. The problems arose due to incomplete lists of voters in the fifth special electoral unit. But, Olujic said that the problems were being solved on the spot.

Compliance With Electoral Law

LD2910212095 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Jasenka Dudic has interviewed [Croatian Electoral Commission Chairman] Dr. Krunoslav Olujic:

[Begin recording] [Dudic] Did the elections for the Croatian Assembly's Chamber of Deputies pass legally?

[Olujic] I hold that for the most part the elections for the Chamber of Deputies of the Croatian Assembly passed in an orderly manner—that they were carried out in complete compliance with the electoral law and all obligatory regulations, technical regulations and those setting out the implementation of elections. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Tudjman Remark Causes Uproar

AU2910195395 Paris AFP in English 1907 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Zagreb, Oct 29 (AFP)—Sunday's [29 October] Croatian legislative elections might have to be rerun because of a remark made by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman in front of television cameras as he was leaving a polling station, the head of the country's electoral commission said.

Asked by reporters after voting what he thought the outcome of the election would be, Tudjman replied—"It is known"—a slogan of his ruling Croatian Democratic Union party (HDZ).

"That violated the law forbidding political statements on the day of the vote and will have to be taken into consideration when we decide whether or not the election results are valid," Krunoslav Olujic told journalists after polls closed.

The remark produced guffaws of laughter from assembled reporters, who doubted that the commission would really wish to cancel election results expected to see the return to power of the ruling party, led by Tudjman.

Tudjman Addresses HDZ Rally in Zagreb 27 Oct

LD2810002295 Zagreb HTV Television in Serbo-Croatian 2140 GMT 27 Oct 95

[Highlights from speech by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman at a Croatian Democratic Union rally in Ban Jelacic Square in Zagreb on 27 October—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Today we have a free and independent, sovereign and democratic Croatian state. We have an armed force that has to be recognized by both Europe and America, an armed force which defeated the Serbian and Yugoslav army in a way it had never been defeated in history. But, let us remember the circumstances in which this was created. [passage omitted] We should remember all that, dear brothers and friends, how we created this Croatia and placed it among the sovereign and free nations of the world. We will liberate the remaining part of the occupied western Srijem and eastern Slavonia and Baranja—with Vukovar which is the symbol of Croatian resistance and Croatian suffering. We will liberate it in this way or that. We will liberate it, if possible by peaceful means. Do you know why? To avoid casualties, because I value more every drop of Croatian blood and every Croatian life than hundreds or thousands of destroyed enemies, [cheers of Franjo, Franjo] but also to prove to the world and to democratic Europe and America that the sovereign and independent Croatian state is not a continuation—as some have written—of some Nazi Croatia linked with Germany, but that it is a democratic state which coordinates its policy with the democratic world.

But we told the democratic world: We support your peace-making efforts, and we want to liberate our Vukovar and Baranja as part of our peace-making efforts. But if you cannot ensure this, we will liberate it by all our means, and you will see a new thundering storm [cheering from the crowd] [passage omitted: reporter summarizes passage covered by second referent item]

Not only did we create our state and our powerful military force, but with our policy and our power, we helped to preserve the Croatian existence in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Through the creation of the Croat Republic of Herzeg-Bosnia we helped prevent the fall of the whole of Bosnia into the hands of the Yugo-Serb aggressors. Because we created all that, we made possible the signing of the Washington agreement on the Croatian-Bosniak-Muslim federation. But that federation can only be a guarantee of safety for the Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina if it relies on Croatia. This is why Croatian people must understand that the Washington agreement speaks about the confederation in the interest of the Croat people throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina and because of the strategic interests of the Croatian state.

Furthermore, at the invitation of the government of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Mr. Izetbegovic and his supporters, we sent our army to Bosnia and helped the Croatian defense Council [HVO], the local Croat forces, and the Bosnian forces. Our forces liberated the largest chunks of the recently liberated Bosnian areas. [cheering of Franjo, Franjo]

So, dear Croatian brothers and sisters, it is true that never before in history have Croatian arms protected as many Croat lands as today. It is also true that we will have to implement the Washington agreement in order to ensure the creation of such a federation and such relations between the federation and Croatia which will ensure that the Croat existence there is not threatened again—as it was by the Serbs yesterday—by those Bosnian extremists who would like to impose relations which would not grant complete equality between the Croat and the Muslim nations. One of the tasks of Croatia's future policy lies in that. [passage omitted: Tudjman said that after a parliamentary debate, it transpired that only seven percent of the people who acquired property through the privatization process were members of the HDZ; he vowed to carry out the privatization in an honest way and to prosecute thieves and war profiteers. He said it is not true that pensioners were cheated out of 13 percent of their pensions; he knows what it is like to be a poor pensioners; he promises that Croatia will become a country of prosperity and will be able to increase wages and pensions. Tudjman then comments on the renaming of Dinamo Zagreb soccer club]

Do not allow yourselves to be the instrument in the hands of anyone else but Croatian policy. You have the possibility of building your country for yourselves and your children, and for the future of the Croatian people.

With Croatian democracy and freedom we will prevent an exodus. Thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of Croats went into the world. I have met them everywhere from the North to the South Pole, from the deserts of Chile to the deserts of Australia, from Canada to New Zealand. They live in desert-like conditions where there is not as much greenery as in this garden here. They live in conditions where temperatures reach 40 above zero in the summer and 40 below zero in the winter. They left this earthly paradise of our homeland Croatia. They left because there was no

Croatian freedom, no Croatian state. Those people are coming back in the thousands. They were in the forefront of creating Croatian democracy and Croatian freedom. Defense Minister Gojko Susak listed some ten names of warriors and Croatian officers—generals and other high-ranking officers—who led the war for Croatia. Those people are in the government and are active in the economy. They are already coming back. We have to make sure that they come back in large numbers because our liberated Croatian land is deserted from Lika and Knin to Podravina. And Vukovar too will tomorrow not only be destroyed, but also deserted.

So, dear young people of Croatia, your place is here, think of how to unfurl your creative potential here, and do not go abroad because you will not find Croatia out there in the world. Those who are leaving are either under the influence of other people's ideas or under the influence of those who do not believe in their people and their state; or they have no feeling of national belonging. Unfortunately, there are such people in all nations, but they are in the minority.

The Croatian people have proved their maturity at this crucial point. The Croatian people—headed by the HDZ [Croatian Democratic Union]—has achieved a national revival of the kind no nation has achieved in its history; national revival in which the entire national intelligentsia took part—apart from a handful of Pharisee traitors; in which fishermen and ploughmen, peasants and workers took part; in which all segments of society, including even the descendants of Croatian nobility, took part. It is precisely for that reason that Croatia could create an armed force and successfully fight for a place in the world.

This is the guarantee of the future of the Croatian state for centuries to come. In order to make it impossible for anyone to question all this ever again, we need the victory of the HDZ in these elections too. Do not believe those who say that the HDZ wants to win a majority greater than before, which would create a one-party system. Look around. In all nations and countries there have been periods when in the interest of the people certain parties ruled for decades—in the interest of the Croatian man and Croatian future. This is now the case with the HDZ.

Hence, I call on you to vote for the deputies who presented themselves to you today, who are the sons of your and our Zagreb, of our Croatia, who—together with me—guarantee that they will solve the problems of this city, of Zagreb, which is the capital of all Croats.

Long live the HDZ. Long live the only and eternal Croatia. [audience cheers]

Croatian Serbs Vote on 'Separate Ballot Paper'

LD2810000895 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2258 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Zagreb, Oct 27 (TANJUG)—Serbs in Croatia will vote in Sunday's elections on a separate ballot paper to send only three representatives to the Croatian Parliament.

Serb representatives will account for only 2.2 percent of the total number of deputies in the 127-seat House of Representatives.

This has finally and formally reduced the Serbs to a marginal ethnic minority in Croatia after centuries of living in these lands.

In the first multiparty elections in 1990, the Serbs voted for more than 30 deputies, and when Croatia seceded from former Yugoslavia in 1992, the new government gave them barely 13 seats in Parliament.

The number of seats for the Serbs in this election has been determined on the basis of the governent's estimate of how much of the Serb community has remained in Croatia since the secession.

According to information available to international organisations, about 500,000 Serbs have been forced to leave their homes of the 580,000 Serbs living in the territory according to the 1991 census.

Serb activists in croatia warn that many of the Serbs will not dare ask for the separate pink ballot paper designed for the Serb minority, because that would mean drawing attention to their national identity.

Serbs have been driven out of Croatia en masse in the 1991 war of secession and two subsequent Croatian aggressions on the western, northern and southern parts of the republic of Serb Krajina, the state proclaimed by the Serbs in Croatia when it seceded.

Thousands of Serbs were killed and their houses plundered and torched in the course of the aggressions, mounted in early May and August of 1995.

The Croatian Government has been doing everything to prevent the Serb refugees' return, and has been denying Croatian citizenship to the few remaining Serbs, which has in turn deprived them of all civil rights.

Authorities Accused of Interference

AU2910165095 Paris AFP in English 1607 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Zagreb, Oct 29 (AFP)—The Serb National Party (SNS) has accused Croatian authorities of interfering with the voting of minority Serbs during Sunday's [29 October] legislative elections in Croatia.

"They are preventing Serbs from voting on ballots intended for them," SNS Vice President Veselin Pejnovic told AFP.

The names of minority Serb candidates are printed exclusively on pink ballots which voters must ask for before entering the polling booth.

The ballots listing candidates from other parties are white or green.

Croat officials manning polling stations have in some cases refused to provide the pink ballots when asked, Serb voters told the SNS vice president, according to Pejnovic.

In other cases, he said, the pink ballots with the names of Serb candidates were hidden under other documents on tables at the polling stations.

A member of the Croatian electoral commission, Vladimir Separovic, denied that any such irregularities had taken place. "We have not received any complaints," he told AFP Sunday afternoon.

The Serb minority in Croatia, which stood at 600,000 in 1991, numbers less than 200,000 today, and their number of fixed seats in the national legislature has dropped from 13 to three.

Opposition Leader Warns of 'European Paraguay'

AU2810180895 Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG in German 28 Oct 95 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Mesic Warns of 'European Paraguay'"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Zagreb—If President Franjo Tudjman's Croatian rightist-nationalist government party HDZ [Croatian Democratic Community] wins the parliamentary elections on 29 October, "Croatia will develop like a South American system and will become a country like Paraguay, for instance."

In an interview with AUSTRIA PRESSE AGENTUR, Stipe Mesic, former Croatian prime minister and current opposition leader, draws a somber picture of the future of a Croatia dominated by the HDZ: "We will have a general—Tudjman—as the leader, and until his death because he will have proclaimed himself as president for life. The country will continue to be in the hands of just a few privileged families." [passage omitted]

Special Election Lists 'Cause Suspicion'

AU3010125195 Zagreb GLOBUS in Serbo-Croatian 27 Oct 95 p 10

[Article by Djurdjica Klancir: "Over 200,000 Voting Ballots Were Allegedly Sent to Germany, Whereas Germans Claim That There Are Not More Than 90,000 Potential Voters There!"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Krunislav Olujic, president of the Electoral Commission of the Republic of Croatia, mentioned in one of his latest interviews that the number of citizens whose registered place of residence is outside of Croatia, and who will vote for special lists, has grown to 460,000.

He did not explain how that number was determined, he only claimed: "This data was established precisely in Zagreb." He decisively added that the exact number of the Bosnia-Herzegovina Croats, whose place of residence is not registered in Croatia, is not known to him.

In fact, only a few days before the elections, it is still not known exactly—or at least approximately—how many Croats from the diaspora will vote for the special lists, i.e. for the 12 representatives of the house of representatives of the parliament.

However, there is no institution in Croatia that could give the exact number, or at least a reliable estimation, as to how many voters are expected in Germany. Or in any other country in which Croatian citizens are allowed to vote.

In the Electoral Commission of the Republic of Croatia, on Monday, 23 October, a female voice from the team "responsible for the diaspora" answered that the Electoral Commission did not have any data whatsoever on how many voters there were in the diaspora: This data is in the Zagreb Office for Administration and Judiciary, because that institution has central documentation about all Croatian citizens whose registered places of residence are outside of Croatia.

However, the city office claims that this is only partial data—they forward the data to the ministry of foreign affairs, and they pass it on to the embassies and consular departments in the world, where those lists are updated with the names of the persons who have not been included in the central documentation in Zagreb.

According to their data, in the diaspora there could be altogether 364,951 voters (at least). Most of them live in Bosnia-Herzegovina: 303,226. As we have been warned in the office, the data about the Bosnia-Herzegovina Croats (without places of residence in Croatia) are most precise. The data for Australia (865), the United States (564) or Germany (27,382) is certainly not complete....

Where Are the Complete Data?

In the foreign ministry they claim, however, that they only mediate, that they forward the data from the central documentation to embassies and consular departments, but that they do not take part in the updating of the data and lack "real," or "complete" information on the voters from the diaspora. They do not have the figure of 460,000 voters.

Asja Ettinger, from the city office for administration and judiciary, explains: They have data on all persons who have been registered in the central book of citizens after 8 October 1991, and whose registered place of residence is not in Croatia.

However, there are persons who registered their place of residence [in Croatia] a long time ago, whereas in reality they have not been living here for ages....

After all, it would be enough if the emigrants proved their citizenship with their passports and exercised their voting rights directly at election sites.

That means that only after the elections will it be possible to know how many voters there are in the diaspora!

Can the number of diaspora voters be estimated on the basis of the number of Croatian emigrants who responded to the call to vote in the elections in 1992?

Definitely not. In the Zagreb office they do not have that data; the foreign ministry claims that the Election Commission has those data, whereas the Election Commission claims it has absolutely no information as to how many people from the diaspora voted in the latest elections, because—it does not need it!

A member of the state [election] commission said recently that such data can only be found in the parliament archives, in the archives of the Election Commission.

A clerk from the archives kindly told us that they had never received any data on the number of voters from the diaspora!

Random Choice

The data published in VJESNIK on 2 August 1992 serves as the sole indicator for the latest elections: For those elections, 213,000 voting ballots were sent for the election of the republic president and of the representatives in the house of representatives—most of them went to Australia, 60,000.

According to the statement of the president of the Election Commission of the Republic of Croatia, Krunoslav Olujic, 151 voting locations have been formed in the states that allow voting.

According to the latest news from the State Election Commission, in all these locations, both the opposition and the ruling party have the right to appoint one member of the election commission.

If the opposition parties have not agreed on the "candidate" by 25 October at 11 o'clock, the member will be selected at random.

Theoretically, the opposition can control the elections in Paraguay and in Herzeg-Bosnia....

In practical terms, the preelection staffs of the opposition admit that that is—hardly feasible!

In other words, the special election lists for the diaspora, which provoked alarm among the opposition as soon as they were presented in the parliament, together with the rest of the news about the electoral system, still cause suspicion.

Despite the fact that the final number of voters for the special lists is not definitely known, on the basis of the data from the central office in Zagreb it can be concluded that a large majority of the diaspora will be represented by the Croats from Bosnia-Herzegovina, or, rather, that the voters from [self-proclaimed] Herzeg-Bosnia will decide on the 12 representatives from the diaspora!

Remarks from Bosnia-Herzegovina

Reducing the Bosnia-Herzegovina Croats to the status of the Croatian diaspora has already opened numerous political questions. As reported by HINA, Haris Silajdzic, prime minister of Bosnia-Herzegovina, said, in unofficial comments to journalists, that in Bosnia-Herzegovina "somebody gave the consent for the voting to be organized, but the government has not been informed of it, nor has its opinion been asked for."

Edhem Bicakcic, vice-president of the Party of Democratic Action [SDA], also commented on the Bosnia-Herzegovina Croats' voting for the Croatian Parliament: "We believe that in this way the Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina could only bring themselves to the position of a national minority, but that is their own problem. We will carefully observe these activities, and we will take suitable measures if there are any attempts of abuse in these elections. Yet we hope that the Croats from here will accept Bosnia-Herzegovina as their homeland."

The HDZ of Bosnia-Herzegovina publicly appealed to all Croatian citizens in Bosnia-Herzegovina to take part in the elections.

On the other hand, the Croatian Party of Rights [HSP] of Bosnia-Herzegovina has called the citizens with dual citizenship not to take part in the elections for the Croatian parliament, because, if they do, they would violate the state law of Bosnia-Herzegovina!

Ismet Dautbasic, president of the Constitutional Court of Bosnia-Herzegovina, reacted in a particularly agitated way; he explicitly claimed that the Bosnia-Herzegovina Croats, by taking part in the elections for the Croatian parliament, automatically questioned their status as constituent nation!

Dautbasic claims that there has been no such example in the entire world, and bearing in mind that the parliament is the legislative body of the Croatian state, by agreeing to vote on its composition, the Croats—citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina—could become a "Trojan horse," through which "the Croatian state organs would try to put the territory inhabited by those citizens under their own influence!"

Some thoroughly practical questions also open up. Will the Croats from Bosnia-Herzegovina, in a possible referendum on the confederation of Croatia and the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, have the right to vote on two sides or only one?

It is a fact that the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Croatia has refused the request for an evaluation of the constitutionality of the Law on Changes and Amendments of the Law on the Election of Representatives in the Parliament of the Republic of Croatia—a request posed by a number of opposition representatives from the house of municipalities ['zupanijski dom'] of the parliament. That means that the Croatian Constitutional Court decided that the special lists for the diaspora were constitutional.

Fear of Manipulations

However, after the political analysis of the very idea of special lists, now—on the eve of the elections—there obviously arise some new problems: It has been clearly proved that the voting mechanism for special lists is the most vulnerable part of the new electoral system. And this means that the suspicion that has accompanied their legalization in the new electoral law necessarily marks all the parliament members elected on their basis.

The diaspora, or rather, for the most part, the Croats from Bosnia-Herzegovina, will elect 12 parliament members, i.e. 10 percent of all future representatives in the house of representatives. That may be the factor that will tip the election scales.

The opposition representatives claim that the special lists have actually been invented precisely in order to tip the "election scales" in favor of the HDZ.

Tudjman Pledges To Free Eastern Slavonia

'Let Us Be Patient'

AU2710202195 Paris AFP in English
1959 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Zagreb, Oct 27 (AFP)—Croatian President Franjo Tudjman said Friday he wanted to resolve the dispute over Eastern Slavonia peacefully, but vowed to forcibly retake the last separatist Serb stronghold in Croatia if necessary.

Tudjman, speaking at the last electoral meeting of his Croatian Democratic Community party ahead of legislative elections here Sunday, said that a peaceful resolution should be reached "within weeks" to avert the use of force.

He also promised to protect the rights of ethnic Serbs living in the region.

"We will free Eastern Slavonia one way or another," he told supporters. "It is possible to do so peacefully, because I value each Croatian's life over all the continents, but also because I want to show the world that Croatia is a democratic country and we support peace efforts."

But he warned that if an agreement to return Eastern Slavonia to Zagreb's rule is not reached within weeks he would order a military operation similar to the one that allowed Zagreb to reclaim separatist Serb territory in western Slavonia and Krajina.

"Let us be patient," Tudjman added. "We still have a few weeks ahead of us."

Croatia has set a deadline of November 30 to resolve the dispute but diplomats were hopeful it could be resolved this weekend during talks talks in an eastern Croatian town.

But earlier Friday rebel Serb leaders cast doubt on hopes that a deal could be struck with Croatian negotiators.

Rebel Serb leader Milan Milanovic said in the Serb-held town of Erdut that it would be difficult to wrap up an agreement on the region's status before next Monday, the TANJUG news agency said.

'Action Before Christmas' if Talks Fail

LD2910151995 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Gojko Susak, the defense minister of the Republic of Croatia, was among the senior members of the Croatian Government who voted today. Mirjana Grahovac reports.

[Grahovac] [passage omitted] After casting his vote, the minister stressed in a brief statement for journalists that he expected a high turnout. Asked what will follow after the elections in respect of the peace talks, Minister Susak said:

[Begin Susak recording] I hope that the negotiations on eastern Slavonia will be successful. If not, there will be action before Christmas. [end recording]

Tudjman Tells Army Officers To Maintain Readiness

LD2810134895 Zagreb Radio Croatia Network in Serbo-Croatian 1200 GMT 28 Oct 95

[Speech by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman in Zagreb to newly promoted Army officers on 28 October—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Text] Ladies and Gentlemen, officials, soldiers, and officers of the Croatian Armed Forces. I congratulate you on your promotions and the awards I have presented you with in the name of the homeland, for your services in the tasks—which are not only of historic importance to the Croatian state but also of broad significance for strategic relations in this part of Europe—and which have made possible not only the liberation of the greatest part of the occupied areas of Croatia, but also the international community's peace initiative, led by the United States.

You, ladies and gentlemen, have won the recognition of the homeland, and this at the same time represents an obligation on you to continue to strive for personal perfection and prepare those bodies which you head in the Armed Forces. After all, the whole homeland is not yet free, and our Armed Forces, including all branches of the Croatian Army, and the police forces of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, must be ready, if necessary, to carry out the orders they receive.

Naturally, we would like the liberation of the remaining occupied areas to be carried out in a peaceful way. We have told this to the international community, the UN General Assembly, and all international factors, but the guarantee for this to happen can only be the readiness of our Armed Forces to carry out their tasks in the way they have done, and in a way the whole of Croatia has done in operations Flash, Storm, [?Summer] and Mistral.

Ladies and gentlemen, these promotions and awards represent both a recognition of your achievements, and at the same time an obligation on you to continue to serve your country. I am convinced that you will carry out this task honorably, as you have done hitherto. [applause]

Serbs Cancel Planned 28 Oct Talks on E. Slavonia

AU2810145195 Paris AFP in English 1350 GMT 28 Oct 95

[By Peter Cunliffe-Jones]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Osijek, Croatia, Oct 28 (AFP)—In a new setback to peace in the Balkans, Croatian Serb negotiators on Saturday [28 October] cancelled planned talks with the Zagreb government over the last piece of Serb-held land in the country.

The cancellation came a day after President Franjo Tudjman, addressing a pre-election rally in Zagreb, again warned the Serbs who are holding the eastern Slavonia region to strike a peace deal "within weeks" or see the army move in to take over by force.

The cancellation, only hours before the talks were due to begin in the town of Osijek, near the Serb-held region, left Croatian officials "confused and angry," a UN official said.

A Croatian official said the cancellation meant that no talks would take place before his country's legislative elections, due on Sunday.

"There will be nothing today, there will be nothing tomorrow," he said. "We will not negotiate in the middle of elections."

In lieu of the meeting that was due to bring the two protagonists together in Osijek, the U.S. ambassador to Croatia, Peter Galbraith, and the UN mediator on the former Yugoslavia, Thorvald Stoltenberg, travelled to the Serb held town of Erdut to meet with the Croatian Serbs.

The UN official said they then hoped to meet with the Croatian side on Sunday.

He said the Serbs had asked for more time to study the proposed deal drawn up by U.S. and UN officials, which they had only received late on Friday.

"Due to the fact that the latest document was delivered so late yesterday, the co-chairmen decided that a process of bilateral consultations today and tomorrow will be useful", UN spokesman Douglas Coffman said.

He said that after last-minute changes, the document being proposed to settle the four year dispute over eastern Slavonia was only delivered to the Serb side late Friday.

"They got mad and said they needed time to study it", an official close to the talks said.

Croatian negociator Hrvoje Sarinic and his Serb counterpart Milan Milanovic had been scheduled to meet at noon to thrash out details of a deal being brokered by .

The plan handed over Friday detailed how eastern Slavonia, a thin strip of land on Croatia's border with Serbia, could return peacefully to Zagreb's control, with Serbs who lived there before war broke out in 1991 being allowed to remain under the protection of an international interim authority.

The region, which borders the state of Serbia, is home to some 170,000 people.

The length of time for which the interim authority would operate has been the sticking point in four previous rounds of talks, but diplomats close to the process said this week a deal was "almost in the bag" after the Serbs caved in on some of their demands.

On Friday however, Milanovic appeared to cast doubt on hopes of an early deal, saying: "It is unrealistic to expect (an agreement) to be signed before the end of November."

Tudjman, whose ruling Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) party is expected to smash the opposition in Sunday's election, promised in a final election rally late Friday that he would return Eastern Slavonia to government rule, by peaceful means if possible, and by force if not.

"We will free eastern Slavonia one way or another," he told supporters.

Reject 'Speedy Reintegration'

LD2810193595 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1906 GMT 28 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Erdut, 28 Oct (TANJUG)—The Serb side did not accept the proposal for an agreement on a peaceful solution for the Srem-Baranja district, offered in Erdut today by international mediators Peter Galbraith and Thorvald Stoltenberg.

After two and one-half hours of talks with the international mediators, Milan Milanovic, head of the Serb negotiating team, said that it is impossible to accept the agreement since the fundamental objections of the Serb side have been ignored.

"What the document spells out is in fact a very speedy reintegration into Croatia, which the people do not want," Milanovic specified.

He added that the first aim of the talks have not been achieved, namely to create conditions for around 200,000 inhabitants of the Srem-Baranja district to remain living peacefully in their territory.

Regardless of the failure of today's round of talks, Milanovic confirmed the Serb side's readiness to continue holding talks.

The fact that this agreement would mean a very speedy reintegration into Croatia of the Srem-Baranja district is best exemplified by Point 9, which was presented to journalists by Slavko Dokmanovic, a member of the Serb delegation.

That point states that as soon as the agreement comes into effect Croatia can deploy its regular police force and customs officers on the internationally recognized border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

"If we accept this, we would become a ghetto severed from the mother country, left completely to the tender mercies of Croatia," Dokmanovic said.

Goran Hadzic and Maj-Gen Dusan Loncar, members of the Serb delegation, particularly stressed the complete unanimity of the whole negotiating team in deciding not to accept the draft agreement.

"That would have been reintegration at record speed because the agreement provided for the district to be demilitarized in only 30 days, and the Croats would be allowed to take control of the border," Loncar added. [passage omitted]

International Mediators Pro-Croatian

LD2810225295 Belgrade SRNA in Serbo-Croatian 2152 GMT 28 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Vukovar, 28 Oct (SRNA)—The Serb negotiating team of the Srem-Baranja district did not sign the 11-point agreement on the normalization of relations with Croatia in Erdut today because its acceptance would place the Serb people in that area in a true ghetto.

This was stressed at a news conference by the Serb negotiating team, after the talks today with negotiators Stoltenberg, Galbraith, and Ahrens, who drafted the agreement on the normalization of relations.

The content of the document, drafted by the mediators, does not satisfy the interests of the Serb people of Srem and Baranja, and does not grant them basic guarantees or human rights, journalists were told.

It was also said that negotiators Stoltenberg, Galbraith, and Ahrens did not include in the agreement the objections referred to them by the Serb negotiating team.

The document which was offered stresses that in the two-year transition period there is to be no UN administration over the Srem-Baranja district, but only Croatian police and custom officers who would immediately be sent to the border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which the Serbs find -unacceptable.

The Serb negotiators said that the mediators acted in a very undiplomatic way, clearly advocating the interests of the Croatian Government. They stressed that the Serb side will not sign anything detrimental to the people.

Maj-Gen Dusan Loncar, commander of the Slavonia-Baranja Corps and member of the Serb negotiating team, stressed that the Serb delegation advocates and respects only the interests of the people, and warned that if the international community does not honor this, the Serbs will know how to defend their centuries-old territories.

At the end of the news conference, it was announced that the negotiations will continue, and that Stoltenberg will stay in constant touch with the Serb delegation until the summit in Ohio.

Serb Leader Assails Croat Moves on E. Slavonia

LD2910173995 Belgrade SRNA in Serbo-Croatian 1617 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Kragujevac, 29 Oct (SRNA)—Slavko Dokmanovic, president of the Srem-Baranja District Council, has said that if the international community wants a peaceful solution to the issue of eastern Slavonia it ought to make it clear to Croatia that it should not start war, and force Zagreb to respect international conventions and human rights.

He said in today's "Sign of the Times" program on Kragujevac Radio that the Serb side in Slavonia "approaches the negotiating process with a sincere attitude, giving up its maximum goals," whereas the Serb negotiators were presented with a document which failed to take account of any of their major criticisms.

Dokmanovic, a member of the Serb negotiating team, says that the Serbian side received the sizeable document only two days ago so its representatives have not had enough time to examine it, and "considering all the things that have not been agreed upon, we could not sign it."

He stressed that nowhere in the documents that the Serb side has signed so far is there any mention of peaceful reintegration; the Serbs from eastern Slavonia advocate an interim period during which relations can be normalized and conditions created for a peaceful resolution.

We suggested that UN admistration be installed for a period of five years, but we agreed to an even shorter period because it is the foundations that are important rather than the duration of this period. The tabled document, however, literally drags this area into Croatia and to make things even worse, this should happen within, say, the next 30 days, Dokmanovic said in conclusion.

He said that at the beginning of the negotiating process assurances were given that the process would last until the end of November, i.e., until the mandate of UN peacekeeping troops expires.

"We lost 14 days because Croatia did not accept the venue of the talks and we ran out of time, particularly when it was announced that the talks had to end by the end of October, before the Ohio talks," he said.

"Croatia is using all this to buy time so that Operation Storm can be forgotten and it could launch new attacks against the Srem-Baranja region. We want to avoid war and enable the people to live here. However, Croatia wants this territory, and it would be very pleased if we left and it arrived in an empty area without fighting," Dokmanovic said.

"The international community has to force Croatia to choose negotiations and to take into account the real situation when it begins negotiations based on different principles," Dokmanovic said, adding that the other option is war and that east Slavonia will not share the fate of other parts of Krajina.

Serb Slavonia Commander Expects Denouement

AU2810185195 Belgrade VECERNJE NOVOSTI in Serbo-Croatian 27 Oct 95 p 4

["Exclusive" report on interview with Major General Dusan Loncar, "commander of the Srem-Baranja Corps of the Serb Army of Krajina," by Jovanka Simic; place and date not given: "There Will Be No Surprises"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Until the fall of the Knin Krajina (in August of this year), Major General Dusan Loncar had been one of the many officers of the Serb army of Krajina. He is now the only remaining general of that army-commander of the 11th Corps, which is supposed to defend the only remaining part of the RSK [Republic of Serb Krajina], the Srem-Baranja region.

The first impression that one gets meeting Gen. Loncar, a 50-year-old officer of medium height and broad shoulders, is that he carries his almost historic burden of responsibility like a straw. He gives direct answers to the questions about advantages and weaknesses of the 11th Corps and the opponent's army. He stresses with pride the readiness of his "assault fist," a mobile unit that has especially been trained to fill in all the holes on the 178-km long front line.

Only in a more relaxed discussion did he reveal that he is more weighed down by another burden—that of the damaged legend on the invincibility of Krajina fighters, the legend that sank so painfully during the two-day Croatian aggression on Knin, his homeplace of Lika, Banija, and Kordun. It appears that it is not an accident that the last straw of Krajina's military honor has been left in the hands of Dusan Loncar. His words "I am not afraid of death and the enemy, only of the sullied face" uttered at the beginning of this merciless war are still remembered.

"I expect a denouement on this part of the front in the next two days," Gen. Loncar said. "It will be either the signing of an agreement or the beginning of a tough and bloody war. Since in the negotiations thus far, the Croatian side has been trying to impose on us a peace solution that does not satisfy even the minimum of human dignity—namely, the complete reintegration into its borders without any concession—all of our soldiers and the residents of the Srem-Baranja region are aware that every new day can bring a war."

As a member of the negotiating delegation at the negotiations in Zagreb, Osijek, and Erdut, Gen. Loncar was in the position to see for himself that all Croatia cares about is the Srem-Baranja region, not the 200,000 local residents.

Gen. Loncar is also aware that it is the politicians that always decide on the end of the war. Generals do not carry out polices but lead armies, to win wars if these have to be waged.

"Had the Croatian Army attacked us immediately after the defeat in Knin, we would have had difficulties in defending ourselves. Fear and insecurity had crept into the people here," the commander of the 11th Corps says. "The situation is much more favorable for us. The Croats have a material advantage, as the salaries of their soldiers are high and regular. They have modern weapons from abroad. Although UNPROFOR [UN Protection Force] claims the opposite, we know that they have amassed here their elite units from the Bosnian front. However, they do not have the high motivation as my soldiers do when their national pride is at stake. We reckon that there are about 40,000 of them, but the objective advantage is on our side."

The former commander of the Uzice Corps of the Yugoslav People's Army, and then the commander of the Serb army in Herzegovina, some parts of Bosnia, and since two years ago of the Srem-Baranja region, Loncar does not look with disdain at Colonel General Djuro Decak, commander of the Croatian Army's military district of Osijek, who was a waiter in Virovitica before the war.

Since 2 May 1991. when members of the Croatian National Guard Corps led by Branimir Glavas (who is today head of the Osijek county) fled from Borovo Selo in panic, the Croatian Army, with the help of foreign sponsors, has almost reached the level of professionalism. Gen. Loncar knows this very well. As he says, with the help of his right-hand man, Colonel Slobodan Antonovic, a living legend from this front, and Lieutenant Branko Kucekovic, he has introduced almost perfect order and discipline among his soldiers.

"If the war starts, we will most certainly fight as best we can," Gen. Loncar said. "If I live to see peace, I will take my grandson Dusan fishing!"

Official Criticizes Comments by U.S. Congressman

LD2710210695 Zagreb HTV Television in Serbo-Croatian 1830 GMT 27 Oct 95

[Statement by Natasa Rajakovic, spokeswoman of the office of the president of the Croatian Republic, on remarks made by U.S. Congressman Frank Wolf, in Zagreb on 27 October—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Text] This is another in a series of attempts to exert pressure on Croatia at a time when Croatia is facing parliamentary elections and preparations for peace talks in the United States are underway. You all know that the Republic of Croatia has very good relation with the United States, relations of friendship and cooperation. You know that during his visit to New York on the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, President Tudjman had a meeting with President Clinton. That meeting was held in a very constructive and friendly atmosphere, and we really cannot complain at the moment about U.S. policy, which seems to us very, I will say again, constructive and favorable. It certainly is helping in reaching a global peace solution as soon as possible.

It is precisely because of these relations between our two states and between President Tudjman and President Clinton that we were shocked to hear and see this statement by U.S. Congressman Wolf. He is a Republican representative from Virginia. He besmirched Croatia and its authorities, and President Tudjman himself, in such a way that one must ask oneself who he represents and why he made this statement at this moment, when all these things I have mentioned are happening.

Foreign Ministry Views Relations With Australia

AU2710095195 Skopje MIC in English 26 Oct 95

[Unattributed Report: "Bilateral Relations With Australia Must Not Be Burdened by Third Countries"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] If the statement of the acting Foreign Minister of Australia McMalen following the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Republic of Macedonia [The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—FYROM] and Australia is conveyed correctly by the media, the Macedonian Foreign Ministry emphasizes: In the several rounds of talks we had with the Australian side, regarding the establishment of diplomatic relations, the Macedonian side always held on to the principled stance that the bilateral relations between the two countries must not be burdened by the relations with third countries.

It is unacceptable to involve third countries in Australian-Macedonian relations, in this case, the Republic of Greece, with which the foundations of the future comprehensive cooperation are successfully being laid, is said in the announcement of the Foreign Ministry.

Today's "Nova Makedonija" comments: "A real surprise is happening to us here. The Australian Government (according to reliable diplomatic sources, and not the Macedonian Government) worked out a non-residential status of the ambassadors of the two countries, which means that the diplomatic mission of the Australians in Macedonia, and ours in Australia, will wait for some better times, that, in the meantime, the work will be done by 'flying' ambassadors, that the consular and other problems of the vast Macedonian immigration in Australia will be carried out during the 'periodical' visits of the accredited diplomats from both countries." "Until Skopje and Athens resolve their problem with the name," the cited Mr. McMalen says.

The Australians probably know what they are doing, why and what they are saying, but viewed from a Skopian, and as they put it "Slav Macedonian" perspective, the non-residential status of the diplomatic relations implies some conclusions. In general, that the non-residence is actually a cover for the nonresistance of a policy, moreover, a multicultural one in regard to the influence of a segment of the Australian society, the Greek community, and the resistance of another segment, the Macedonian. Whether anyone admits that or not, judging only by logic, this casts a shadow on that policy and the consistency of that policy, when the practicing of the international documents on human rights is in question.

Background to Frckovski Resignation Analyzed

AU3010114495 Skopje PULS in Macedonian 27 Oct 95 p 6

[Commentary by Vasil Mickovski: "Resignation"]

[FBIS Translated Text] I have never placed in question my political responsibility. I offered my resignation to Prime Minister Crvenkovski this morning [26 October].

These were the words with which Minister of the Interior Ljubomir Frckovski addressed the journalists. So, there is a resignation after all. Between the two opposite options—to depart irrevocably from policy or to be "fired" by the prime minister—the minister [of the interior] offered a solution that is somewhere in between. The solution also explains his personal attitude toward the terrorist act and his personal responsibility that has to be politically sanctioned by the government. The people were given the explanation that everybody on duty is responsible to those who have nominated him for what he is doing.

A number of dilemmas remain after Frckovski's resignation. First, does its high level of responsibility reflect the true course of democracy and is this a satisfactory conclusion requiring no further discussion?

These questions will become more important the moment the prime minister decides on the resignation. Nevertheless, it is now clear that Frckovski did not say farewell to the policy as some had speculated. As he said, he was personally affected by the assassination attempt against the president.

Ultimately, we must not disregard the fact that this solution was desired and requested by many, not only in the name of punishing the "culpable," but to get rid of a politician who has caused them nightmares during the past four years.

I am absolutely sure that after the act of personal political responsibility the story about the resignation will not end. In other words, there could be a resignation (as there is) and no reshuffle. If it [the resignation] is not accepted, and this is possible, it is more than certain that the political opponents and a section of public opinion will almost overnight oppose political to moral responsibility, and this topic will definitely be used as political nourishment that will be served on every occasion and every table. Most probably they will say that responsibility will be demonstrated only if the minister is reshuffled. On the other hand, the government will take over responsibility if it does not accept the resignation, while a new mandator will have to be found or elections organized.

Some people say that democracy is, first of all, respect for procedure. Sometimes it is sufficient to observe formalities and to close the case. However, it will not be that easy with us. All possible theoretical and practical examples will be sought and strong political pressure will be applied so as not to make the resignation just a formal question or to leave it only to the government to decide about it. Actually, it is not a secret that the opposition, even before the event had taken place, was exerting strong pressure for new elections, because it proclaimed last year's elections as fake and now they will use Frckovski, a prominent representative of the authority, to the maximum.

A resignation that leads to a direct de-mission or reshuffle (it is definitely of little importance what his departure is called) is used in policy as an "ideal measure" for taking away power and presenting it as an ideal achievement and highly moral act of punishing sins. So, in this way policy is associated with morality and the disputed thesis that the moral mind does not give up political thinking and policy is even allowed to be overwhelmed by ethics and justice. The sinner repents, and after he is unburdened of the earthly burdens that he has been in search of throughout his life, he will now have a clean face and peaceful soul. However, I do not think that an easy transfer from policy to morality is possible, because according to western culture, we know and we believe that you can enter the kingdom of morality the moment you have stepped out from policy. Honestly speaking, I do not believe that Christian morality is the source of the political mind, because these continents are seven seas away. I, therefore, believe that the whole problem has to be observed from the aspect of real policy. It would be pretentious to start a theoretical discussion—that policy tends to reason and that ethics confirms the ideal to which the people tend in a utopian way in this world, in which the direct cause is the resignation of the minister. Basically, policy and reason meet on the centuries' long fractures and turmoil, and everything that is happening on the inside is the technology of ruling, to a greater or smaller extent.

We must admit: From the perspective of realpolitik, the resignation is actually a forced act caused by political and nonpolitical factors (opposition and public opinion) with which the authority, that is the captain of the ship, clears the deck so as to make the journey more agreeable or, if the situation becomes extremely dangerous—he throws out members of the crew to save himself from sinking. I think that this manipulative ability in the hands of the one that has the power and who deliberately accepts to "work" under the command of public opinion is not sufficiently exploited in cases when ministers present resignations. In countries of democratic tradition, the outwitting game between the authority and the people, in which the politicians are good at playing the role of being in the service of the people's will, creates situations in which politicians leave their positions before the votes are counted. Among other things, they [politicians] do this because they have a comfortable place to return to that enabled them to join the power in the first place. Resignations were proscribed with us because there is a prevailing rule that has also been confirmed in practice—he who falls down once is never lifted again. On the other hand, resignations and reshuffles lead to the man's complete excommunication, to disrespect for his dignity, and in authoritarian communism it even leads to physical annihilation.

Macedonia [The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—FYROM] is aspiring to the West, but the day of its becoming "America and England" is far away. The examples are a good lesson, although there is little chance of their being immediately absolved. If we make a thorough analysis, not even there [in the West] can we find pure examples of prompt responsibility. The most powerful of the world's policemen, Edgar Hoover, never even thought of resigning when Kennedy was assassinated because "he found the blame" in the image and act of Lee Oswald. Contrary to this, Lord Carrington resigned from the position of minister of foreign affairs in Great Britain only because he did not presume that Argentines would land on the Falklands and he felt responsible because he did not use diplomatic measures to prevent Argentine expansionism. Francesco Cossiga, the first policeman in the second half of the '70's, did not pack his ministerial bags when the "Red Brigade" kidnapped and later assassinated Aldo Moro, in spite of the general consternation in Italy at the inglorious end of the most popular politician at that time. On the other hand, Cyrus Vance, secretary of state in Carter's administration, after the marines' hazardous helicopter adventure in Iran, brought his own verdict and concluded that he did not belong to that government. Some time ago a story was told in our country about the Japanese myth of responsibility and that the Japanese minister of transport commits hara-kiri if the train is one minute late. Last year, in the Japanese underground some religious extremists poisoned a number of passengers and, so far, as I have been informed, nobody resigned from the government. There was another such example recently in France (nearly every week bombs kill passengers in the Paris underground) and nobody from Zupe's government has yet decided to leave office.

Some might think that these examples are being used as an alibi, others as arguments against Minister Frckovski. They are neither the former nor the latter. The point is different: No government can prevent a minister from leaving. However, there are cases when the government decides to keep its man and bear the burden of political responsibility on its own back at any cost. It is enough if it believes to be strong enough to endure it or to make a proper assessment of what is good and what is bad.

The fact that Frckovski has been involved in policy for four years and that he has continuously been a member of the three coalition governments, the fact that he was assigned with difficult tasks in the construction of the new political system, speak of him as a man greatly trusted by the prime minister and the president. In a way, this suggests that if the government decides to keep the "winning team," then it will probably have difficulty in giving up the services of one of the top "players."

Assembly Adopts Law on Local Self-Management

AU2710194695 Skopje MIC in English 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The Macedonian Assembly adopted the Law on local self-management yesterday. Eighty-three MPs from SDSM [Social Democratic Alliance of Macedonia], LP [Liberal Party] and SP [Socialist Party] were in favour of the law, two MPs—Tomislav Stojanovski (DPM [Macedonian Democratic Party]) and Hisen Ramadani (independent) abstained from voting, and eight—six from PDP [Party for Democratic Prosperity] and two independent MPs (Mersel Biljali and Abduljadi Vejseli) were against. Directly before the voting, the representatives of PDPA [Party for Democratic Prosperity of Albanians] and NDP [People's Democratic Party] indignantly walked out of the parliamentary hall, because, as Sali Ramadani explained, their dissatisfaction with the text of the law and the attitude of the Government and the other MPs toward their demands.

Following the voting, the vice-president of Assembly Tito Petkovski noted: "The adoption of this Law rounds off five years of hard work of this government, as well as those from the previous mandate. It rounds off the political system of the Republic of Macedonia [The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—FYROM] and creates the possibility to proceed with the second local elections in the Republic of Macedonia."

Before the voting, the coordinator of the PDP parliamentary group Ismet Ramadani explained that his associates will not be giving their "yes" vote because "the Law does not met our expectations." Despite the obvious step forward that has been made by the Government, nonetheless, they feel that certain important questions regarding the authorizations and use of languages, have not been accepted.

Upon leaving the parliamentary hall, on behalf of the "party of five" from PDPA and NDP, Sali Ramadani called on his "copatriots, i.e. (PDP MPs) not only not to vote in favour of this Law, but to walk out of the hall together with them, to withdraw their ministers and other officials, and to break off the fictional coalition." Ismet Ramadani (PDP) had only this to say: "I'm not accepting any lectures about my party from immature boys in politics."

Justice Minister Praises Law

AU2710214295 Skopje MIC in English 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] "I feel, in a way, satisfied, since I've finished a very good and complicated matter in one of the most complex and delicate laws, which also regulates a very sensitive matter. The parliamentary debate has shown that this is a very delicate matter, where the interests of the local communities and the state, and the interethnic relations in the Republic of Macedonia [The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—FYROM] are balanced out. I feel we have set a standard way, or to put it differently, a moderate norm that can present the basis for the development of the local self-management, for democratization of the state authority, a certain delegation of the authority of the local self-management and for the future development of the interethnic relations."

When asked to comment on the fact that one more systematic law has been adopted without the votes of the representatives of the Albanians, [Justice] Minister [Vlado] Popovski said:

"Ask them. But, in any event, it's a fact that the representatives of the Albanians in Macedonia took an active, consistent and constructive part in this Law, as well as all systematic laws for which they did not vote from the start (from the first phases of the draft-texts) up to the act of voting itself. Only they can explain their absence from the act of voting. I can assume that it is connected with certain political, to put it in such a way, a political marketing account. But, that's only my assumption. Maybe it's not correct."

France Opens Honorary Consulate in Bitola

AU2710094795 Skopje MIC in English 26 Oct 95

[FBIS Transcribed Text] An honorary French Consulate was opened yesterday in the University library "St. Clement of Ohrid" in Bitola, in the French reading room. Kaliopi Krivasija-Stilipovich, secretary in the president's office of the Bitola University, has been appointed first honorary consul.

At the ceremony on this occasion, the French ambassador to Macedonia Mr. Patrick Crisman handed Krivasija the necessary documents, credentials and other important materials for the work of the Consulate, and emphasized that this act creates even greater possibilities for cooperation between Macedonia and France. Soon, the honorary Consulate is expected to move to more appropriate offices. The opening of the honorary Consulate in Bitola has started off the process of opening other honorary Consulates, for instance, Turkey and Italy, with which after 80 and more years, Bitola will become a Consular city again.

Two Candidates Withdraw From Presidential Race

Tadeusz Zielinski

LD3010095995 Warsaw Polskie Radio First Program Network in Polish 0900 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] We have just received a fax from the election staff of Tadeusz Zielinski announcing his intention to withdraw his presidential candidacy. [passage omitted]

Marek Markiewicz

LD2910170695 Warsaw TV Polonia Network in Polish 1600 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Marek Markiewicz has withdrawn from the presidential election. Markiewicz told Poznan's Radio Merkury that his platform was not accepted by the electors, so it required him to withdraw.

New Polls on Presidential Election Released

CBOS Poll

WS2710144595 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 27 Oct 95 p 1

[Report by NIKA: "Public Opinion Research Center. Two Weeks Ahead of the Elections. Two in Front"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The difference between Lech Walesa (23 percent) and Aleksander Kwasniewski (27 percent) is constantly growing smaller, according to the results of the latest poll held by the Public Opinion Research Center [CBOS]. The polls was directed to the voters who declared their intention to participate in the elections (80 percent of all of the polled).

Next on the ranking list is Jacek Kuron (8 percent). Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz was for the first time was not among the top three candidates. Her support fell, in over a month, from 8 percent to 5 percent. The same number of respondents intended to vote for Tadeusz Zielinski and Jan Olszewski. The results from last week for Waldemar Pawlak (4 percent), Jan Pietrzak (3 percent), and Janusz Korwin-Mikke (2 percent) remain unchanged. Lech Kaczynski, Andrzej Lepper, Marek Markiewicz, and Leszek Moczulski received 1-percent support each. Support for the rest of the candidates was virtually zero. Some 13 percent of the inquired did not know yet how they would vote.

According to the CBOS, the results of the vote will differ in some respect from those obtained in traditional polls. The CBOS estimates are presented below. They were based on the expected electoral participation and on the degree of certainty of voter preference.

According to the estimates done by the Center for Research on Public Opinion [OBOP] at the beginning of October, Poles are most often guided in their decisions by the candidates' personality traits (38 percent) and the hope that the victory of a given candidate will improve their material well-being (24 percent). Political motives are encountered more rarely.

Electoral Preferences According to CBOS Estimates

	Percent
Aleksander Kwasniewski	33
Lech Walesa	27
Jacek Kuron	9
Tadeusz Zielinski	6
Jan Olszewski	6
Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz	5
Waldemar Pawlak	5

OBOP Poll

LD2810141895 Warsaw TV Polonia Network in Polish 1100 GMT 28 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] A poll conducted by the Public Opinion Research Centre [OBOP] reports that, if the presidential elections were held this week, Aleksander Kwasniewski and Lech Walesa would enter the second round. Compared with the previous opinion poll, conducted three weeks ago, Lech Walesa has gained the most support.

Eighty-seven percent of those polled said that they would take part in the elections. Twenty-nine percent, 1 percent fewer than three weeks ago, intended to vote for Aleksander Kwasniewski, 24 percent for Lech Walesa, and 7 percent for Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz, who has lost the most support over the past three weeks. Jacek Kuron and Tadeusz Zielinski can count on the support of 6 percent of those polled. Jan Olszewski would have the support of 4 percent of the electorate, and both Waldemar Pawlak and Janusz Korwin-Mikke could count on 3 percent. The remaining nine candidates would jointly get the support of 6 percent of the electorate.

Between 21 and 24 October, OBOP researched the opinions of almost 1,200 adult Poles. The allowed margin of error in such polls is 2 percent.

ZChN 'Still Supporting' Waltz Candidacy

LD2810173895 Warsaw Polskie Radio First Program Network in Polish 1700 GMT 28 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The Main Board of the Christian-National Union [ZChN] is still supporting Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz in the presidential elections. The decision on this matter was supposed to be made at today's meeting, but so far nothing has changed.

ZChN Chairman Ryszard Czarnecki has said that the ZChN Main Council, which will meet tomorrow, has the full power to decide who has the biggest chance in the presidential elections to block the candidate of the Left. In a resolution adopted by the ZChN, the party calls on all candidates, election teams, and political parties of the Solidarity patriotic camp to declare today that they will support only one candidate in the second round of the election.

Official Backing Not Withdrawn

LD3010094995 Warsaw Polskie Radio First Program Network in Polish 0900 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Wieslaw Chrzanowski, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Christian National Union [ZChN], has said that the ZChN is not interested in the political camp Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz intends to set up after the presidential elections.

Chrzanowski said on Polish Radio that the president of the National Bank of Poland [NBP] has never unambiguously stated that this camp will have a right-wing character, in accordance with the ZChN program. He also recalled that, when giving its backing to Gronkiewicz-Waltz, the ZChN appealed to the candidates not to conduct a negative preelection campaign. Meanwhile, he stressed, Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz attacks President Lech Walesa, putting him on a par with the postcommunist candidate Aleksander Kwasniewski. In Professor Chrzanowski's opinion, this disqualifies Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz from representing the right wing as a candidate.

Yesteday the ZChN Supreme Council did not withdraw backing for Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz but is appealing to its supporters to vote for Lech Walesa in the second round of the presidential elections.

Voters Urged to Support Walesa

LD2910170495 Warsaw TV Polonia Network in Polish 1600 GMT 29 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The Supreme Council of the Christian National Union [ZChN] appealed to electors to vote for President Lech Walesa. In the ZChN's opinion, Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz no longer has a chance of getting through to the second round of the presidential elections.

Meanwhile, Leszek Moczulski, chairman of the Confederation for an Independent Poland [KPN], has appealed to the right-wing candidates to select one of their number as contender for the presidency within three days. If a communist wins the election, the blame will fall on us, Moczulski warned.

During the fifth congress of the KPN, Moczulski appealed for an agreement to Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz, Lech Walesa, and Jan Olszewski. He passed over the remaining right-wing candidates, because, as he explained, they were not bound by the agreement of the St. Catherine's Convention. Moczulski announced that he might withdraw from the elections, even if there is no response to his appeal. He will wait until Wednedsay for the candidates' decisions. The KPN leader said that at least one right-wing politician who is running for the presidency would appear at the congress this evening. However, he did not reveal the name.

Walesa Interviewed on Election Issues

LD2710233895 Warsaw TVP Television First Program Network in Polish 2145 GMT 26 Oct 95

[Studio interview with Polish President Lech Walesa by Bogdan Rymanowski and Antoni Styrczula; from the "Several Hard Questions" program—live, relayed by Warsaw TV Polonia Network in Polish]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Rymanowski] Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Good evening, Mr. President.

[Walesa] Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, how should we understand your recent statement that no one will slow down certain things, that it will be necessary to shoot, that you will do this for the good of the fatherland?

[Walesa] Sir, this is... [pauses] these are abbreviations which have to be set in the situation where they were said. Part was stated in an unauthorized interview for Adam Michnik, part, and similar statements were made at stadiums, where we spoke of how, or where I spoke of how to stop certain processes by the shock method. I spoke of this, of explosions or shooting. Many of you have watched a film where a herd of cattle is running in the wild West and it is necessary to shoot into the air so as to not... [pauses] so that it does not fall off a cliff or something. I spoke of the processes that will perhaps be necessary—perhaps, let it, let it not be necessary—but nonetheless to stop. Precisely, with some bomb. I contained in this a thought, but not a direct thought, only somewhat of a premise.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, your statement could certainly be made light of if not for the fact that two years ago, in an interview for the TYGODNIK SOLIDARNOSC weekly, you spoke in a similar way. I quote: If there will be a provocation, I will, respecting the law, have to. [sentence as heard] If I do not do this, I will be placed before the courts because of the victims.

[Walesa] Yes, sir. As president, I have to envisage various events, and of course I would not wish myself.... [pauses] I would wish that everyone just loves each other, that everything is resolved at the table, that everyone is very much in solidarity with each other, that he who has more share what he has with one who has less. But from what we see the world is not yet like that. In association with this, there might be situations that I have to allow for, so as not to allow myself to be taken by surprise. Sometimes, if someone asks me about such situations, then it is difficult not to reply to the question.

[Rymanowski] Is there a possibility that there will be demonstrations on the streets of Warsaw and that you will take decisions to fire at the demonstrating crowd?

[Walesa] I would like you to be more serious and ask more serious questions. I have been fired at. I do not think of firing. I know, on the other hand, that there are criminals who do fire, and I know that there are special services who cope with this, moe or less. That is why it will not be I who fires. I will not issue such an order. There are others for that. I will only demand things and defend the fatherland in various possible situations.

[Stryczula] Mr. President, why do you suppose that the coming presidential elections might be falsified? And if they might be, then by whom?

[Walesa] Sir, such a possibility always existed. We come from People's Poland, and People's Poland falsified the first elections and the "Three Times Yes" [referendum slogan in early communist days]. I am a child of that system. I am finding out about all of this today. So I can presume that those who come directly from that system might try similar tricks in another time. Thus, I warn, and I also wish to gain by this greater activity of citizens in safeguarding their democracy.

[Rymkanowski] But Mr. President, you did not warn against the parliamentary elections in 1993. You are issuing warnings now, when you are yourself a candidate, when you are seeking reelection.

[Walesa] No, no, you did not listen sufficiently to my statements then.

[Rymanowski] I am listening now.

[Walesa] I always warned and I always issued appeals. On the other hand, this was perhaps less visible, for this was done by others. It is possible to put it still differently. In other elections, parliamentary ones, many more people take part, and then more people are chose, not one man. Then the mutual vigilance against each other is much, much greater. Thus, there need not be so many appeals for everyone because there are so many, because we all guard each other. On the other hand, the point now is there are just 17 people and not 400, that is 560. Aand in conection with this, it is necessary to encourage vigilance far more.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, a concrete question. Are there any rational premises, any reasons for you to send such a letter? I am talking about the letter sent yesterday to Solidarity regions, in which you ask Solidarity to keep its eyes open so that the elections can proceed honestly. Are there any concrete premises for it?

[Walesa] Of course. We cannot fail to notice that Solidarity's role, a role so important in the past, seems to be even more indispensable. That is why by sending such a letter I want to encourage them to take responsibility for Poland. I do not want to destroy the rhythm of work of the union's activists because they have a different aim, but to be vigilant, to control. This is practically a duty of this movement, which won freedom for our homeland.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, in the program "The New Beginning," which originated in 1990, you declared, among other things, that there must be a full settlement of accounts for the past years, that, I quote: Wrongs have to be morally compensated for and victims of persecutions have to be redressed, and the renouncement of revenge cannot mean that illegally obtained privileges will be tolerated. A question arises therefore: How can this declaration made by you five years ago be reconciled with your veto in 1993 of the Law on Pensions, which envisaged, among other things, that security service officers would lose the right to special pensions if they repressed freedom activists?

[Walesa] Dear fourth estate: I request that you do not ask questions without first checking the motives. I do not veto or sign laws capriciously. I check everything, count everything, and take advice from others. [passage omitted]

I occasionally sweep away all sorts of errors that occur. I took up work for Poland, and not just to score some points.

[Rymanowski] Was that an error, Mr. President?

[Walesa] No, I do not regard that as an error. If I had to, I would do it again. For this was the requests of deputies and, simultaneously, errors actually came to exist.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, I have, looking through the newspapers from those days, read one of the letters from a woman pensioner to a weekly paper. You will allow me to quote a section: When the Sejm adopted the reduction of pensions and annuities for former secret policemen, you, Mr. President, said that conscience does not allow you to sign that law for you do not wish to harm innocent people. But, without batting an eyelid, this is still a quote, you have harmed several million pensioners by signing the law on the revision of benefits-the reader of one of the weeklies. How will you reply to people who think like that?

[Walesa] No, I suspect that you do not know or else do not want to know. I have already explained to you.

Of course, I have also committed... [pauses] that is, I have also participated in errors that I assess as errors today. These laws that took away payments for conditions harmful to health, for instance. But, well, I never sign without consultation, as I say. [passage omitted]

The lady has also forgotten that I apologized to pensioners and annuity holders, that it took place like this, although my error here was minimal. I apologized, and I said that if there ever ensues a situation in which I will be able to repair my error, I will repair it. Such a situation transpired this year, and I repaired my error. Whether or not effectively, well, we will see, for the Sejm has rejected my veto, and I have, despite everything, directed the case to the Constitutional Tribunal. We will see what the tribunal does, whether it will rescue these people whom I then by chance hurt without wanting to.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, why do you feel that you are a better candidate for president than the candidates of the left? You have already said, in December 1991 at a meeting with the parliamentary floor group of the Democratic Left Alliance, that if it will be necessary the left will be the president, the vice president; Walesa is with you. That is what you said, these are your words from the Sejm transcripts.

[Walesa] Sir, I wish to reply to you once more that everything that takes place takes place at the appropriate time. You will not get oranges growing in the snow no matter how you cultivate them. That is why it is not permitted to extract quotes out of the context in which they take place. I know that democracy must be respected, and I respect it. I know that little of society is, nonetheless, communist. This option has the support of not more than 30 percent. Seventy percent belongs to another option. It is necessary to make the effort for the most frank, the most frank and deepest reflection of society to be found in parliament, and not just in parliament. Then the Polish ship of state can be safely steered.

[Styrczula] Mr. President, in the address you made on the day of your swearing in, you, among other things, declared that the universal privatization of Poland is a great task, that Poland ought to become a nation of owners. Everyone can become a co-owner of part of the national wealth, a part of our fatherland. Can you say what you have done about this matter, in concrete terms, over the five years?

[Walesa] Sir, I would like to recall to you and the viewers that, as the only one, I then said that the president cannot have a program since this program will not be implemented, for there will also be a parliament and a government. But everyone [words indistinct] and the people said it cannot be that the president does not have a program. You forced me to write a program, and we wrote one. There had to be things in the program that were ideas and necessities, according to what was thought. On the other hand, they had no chances of being implemented, and I knew this and warned of this. Just as I warn now the candidates and those who are listening to us that in fact, today, so as to speak seriously and treat listeners seriously, it would be necessary to have at least three programs: one for the present situation, where there is no constitution, and more or less for activity such as the way in which I am acting at present. And a program for when there will be a constitution but a constitution for a presidential system. Thus, different actions, different programs. And also another, third program would have to be put before the nation, a program for when there will be a parliamentary cabinet system. In each of these cases, three cases, there is always another program.

[Rymanowski] But are you in favor of universal property enfranchisement?

[Walesa] [Words indistinct] Of course, I expressed myself in favor, and these arguments are generally well known, and here there is no time to repeat them. I have one more argument that is not being raised, and I raise it and I do not know why this is not being discussed by the fourth estate, that means the media.

We, in our future term of office, if I am president, will enter the European Union and NATO, but the point here particularly is the EU. Of course, we will ask the nation whether or not it wishes this. I presume that it will wish it. There will be regulations in the EU that will be obligatory for us as well. People on that side of the economy, and so in the Union, are very... [pauses] are more active, privatized, and we cannot be otherwise. If we do not widely distribute the national wealth to our citizens, then regulations will allow for buying out by the French, Germans, English, for the regulations are everywhere...

[Rymanowski, interrupting] But Mr. President, why over these five years have you not put forward a legislative initiative on the issue of universal property enfranchisement?

[Walesa] Dear sir. You are forgetting that my only task was to see Poland through storms that threatened us and could happen in different configurations, and that I would never be taken by surprise. Well, those configurations and storms were as follows: three different parliaments and six different governments. In some cases I was a perpetrator of what was happening but generally, at any rate, I was not responsible for those events. Each one of those parliaments required different actions and each parliament was simply different. There are people for such things in Sejm commissions and parliament, and not the president. Of course, I could initiate parliamentary actions but by doing so I would destroy ideas and programs which were then being created. I could not, as it were, shoot albeit wise ideas from the side, though I was doing so out of necessity, to preserve reforms and not just to show off my own effectiveness.

[Styrczula] Mr. President, you have just mentioned that we will be a member of the European Union, that we will be a NATO member. I wanted to ask you, since you often return to it, whether we should believe declarations made by both Western politicians and Russian politicians. You often say that in your drawer you have a declaration signed by President Yeltsin, in which he does not express any opposition to Poland joining NATO. President Yeltsin and his entourage had been saying something completely different then to what they have been saying recently. Should we believe the West or should we believe Russian politicians?

[Walesa] Let me put it this way. There are treaties that are kept but we know that not all obligations were kept to the very end in Poland before the war. We have those painful experiences but this is not the point. The point is that we should combine the economy and security so that they will be inseparable. We will not be able to do this if we do not participate in (?European) organizations. That is why we need it today so that we can live in Berlin and have our own branches of manufacturing, and at the same time the French could have theirs in Poland and would not want to drop bombs on their own manufacturing and destroy them. The world has gone so far. However, we will not be able to achieve this, we will not achieve such unity without the participation, without an organized participation. That is why we need an organized entry there.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, the name of this broadcast is "Several Hard Questions." I think that we will not, at the end, avoid a difficult question. Perhaps this is an easy question. Have you, Mr. President, ever in any way collaborated with the Security Service [SB]?

[Walesa] No, ladies and gentlemen, never. Never has anyone ever heard such a thing, most probably: smash the SB, smash communism, and be their agent. This is rubbish. Of course, I had difficult days in the 1970's. Some of you even know that some documents were signed, but I wish to state to you—I know the documentation of these services—and I know that no one who then did time. It never happened that they did not sign documents regarding the questioning, still other documents that were then required. We were not then so very educated. We did not know that it is possible to avoid this. In any case, were someone to try then most probably he would never leave that place.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President....

[Walesa, interrupting] This was 1970.

[Rymanowski] In [words indistinct] on 4 June 1992, which was withdrawn from PAP, you among other things wrote: I tried various possibilities, various methods of struggle. The first time, in December 1970, I signed three or four documents. Can you say, in concrete terms, what documents these were? Was this a protocol of questioning, or was this the signing of some other document?

[Walesa] I would not wish, for I cannot stand deceit. I want the truth, only the truth, and solely the truth. Of course, I did not have to speak of this at all. On the other hand, I like frankness. I even have another case. I even passed money to the trade union, after a year, which was hidden, a year of my presidency. So as to have a clear conscience, I passed the money on, I instructed money that nobody knew about to be passed on. Do you know what reply I received? If he passed money on, then how much did he leave for himself?

[Rymanowski] Mr. President...

[Walesa, interrupting] It is not possible to be honest in this country....

[Rymanowski, interrupting] But you have not replied concretely to the question.

[Walesa] I will reply straight away. Sir, I am just telling you that to be honest in our country it is sometimes very difficult. I, in my honesty, said how things were. And great scandals were made of this.

[Rymanowski] Why was this statement withdrawn?

[Walesa] I state: I have never betrayed anyone, never. I have struggled like a lion, I have subjected myself, my family, to danger. On the other hand, I signed documents because I did not know that it was possible not to sign. This was the year 1970. I repeat: Everyone signed. There was no case of not signing.

[Rymanowski] But in the book *The Road of Hope*....

[Walesa, interrupting] Sir, I do not remember, because this was 26 years ago....

[Rymanowski, interrupting] Mr. President, in the book *The Road of Hope* on page 66, you wrote that it is true that there were interviews and it is also true that you did not come out of this clash completely clean.

[Walesa] Yes.

[Rymanowski] What does this mean?...

[Walesa, interrupting] Sir....

[Rymanowski, interrupting] Not completely clean?

[Walesa] Today, when today I assess the matter... [pauses] then why let oneself be questioned at all? Why sign the interrogation reports at all? For, in fact, later in the 1980's we did not sign these. I never signed anything. A man need not sign. Only I did not know about this at that time, and no one knew. In association with this, I let myself be questioned, and this was an error. This was not clean, for in questioning it was necessary to speak the truth.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, the question arises: Why until now, despite all these accusations that are made against you, have you never done anything to finally reveal these archives of the Security Service and the Security Administration so as to lay to rest all these accusations and perhaps unjust reproaches? Was there a will in this direction on your part?

[Walesa] There has always been, there is, and there will be such a will. Moreover, I will say this: If we do not do this we will be paying terrible bills later. We must do it not for revenge, not to improve our good frame of mind. But there will be such cases, which we have been discussing here, that certain people running for different posts, not necessarily for the post of president, will have sniping shots shot at them by their enemies from the sides. He will not know why people will not support him, why they will move away from him. He will learn all at the last moment. We will be destroying many good activists.

[Styrczula] But Mr. President [words indistinct]

[Rymanowski] But are you in favor of disclosing these documents, these archives?

[Walesa] I am in favor of disclosing these documents....

[Rymanowski, interrupting] But Mr. President, why are you, therefore, supporting Minister Andrzej Milczanowski, who consistently refuses to produce these documents, even to the courts?

[Walesa] Because he cannot. There must be.... [pauses] I have an idea, I know how to do it, I know how to do it. I thought that when one of the governments tried to tackle this problem, it would do it properly. But it just happened to be a bad turn; that government destroyed the idea and it will be very difficult today to do it. I do not even press for it today.

Those, whose origins stem from the previous camp, cannot do this today because they have no moral right to do it. I am not saying that....

[Rymanowski, interrupting] And how about a legislative initiative, Mr. President?

[Walesa] There are eight laws addressing this problem. Am I supposed to file the tenth [as heard] one? And if I did, do you know what would happen? If the president did this, maybe he has something to hide and that is why he puts forward a tenth law. And nine others are on the shelf in the Sejm. That is why I am not doing this, and I think that we must not do it now. We have to wait for the levelling of the parliament. We have to wait for the independence camp and then we will try to do it.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President....

[Walesa, interrupting] It would be a mistake today if we attempted it.

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, a basic question. You spoke about it in Florence: Will you respect the election outcome if you lose?

[Walesa] Of course, I will, ladies and gentlemen. I only served the nation, and I will serve it. I will never do anything to its disadvantage. I will never do anything against democracy. Ca you not see this? In the fervor of struggle, in the fervor of discussion there can be slipups, but, ladies and gentlemen, you must see that other candidates have just one or two meetings. I have ten meetings, I have thousands of people attending. All of the other candidates put together do not have so many listeners and problems as I do. All this is reflected on my quality. [passage omitted]

[Rymanowski] Mr. President. If you win the election, will you try to take revenge on your political opponents in the current term of office?

[Walesa] First, I really am a practicing believer. That is why I have nothing of this sort on my mind. I respect certain principles but, at the same time, I understand which principles cannot be respected, and there are such principles. Let nobody fear, I will never torment anybody because my Christian faith does not allow me to. I do not serve my friends or appease my sense of well-being but I act and do as much as I possibly can. And I know about this too. [passage indistinct]

[Styrczula] But is such a situation possible in which, for instance, you will entrust one of your rivals for the presidential chair the post of prime minister, for instance, and will cooperate, just as the president will....

[Walesa, interrupting] I must say that I do see a number of ministers among these candidates. On the other hand, I on the whole do not see a prime minister in this group, in this 16. I am rudely frank for I could behave differently, say that I do, and so give someone hope. No, I have not, I am not a merchant. I serve the nation. I know perhaps I judge badly, but I seek to select the maximally best solutions. I would choose a number of ministers there, but [words indistinct]

[Rymanowski] Mr. President, the final question to end with. You very often declare that you are a deep believer. Over the last few weeks you have many times spoken of various of your rivals. I will perhaps cite three such quotes: Gronkiewicz is some sort of disease, some sort of pestilence; that which Mrs. Gronkiewicz has done is the solidarity of a hyena; the Kaczynski brothers are people who are doubly small, I had to have little people like the Kaczynski brothers. Are these sorts of statements worthy of....

[Walesa, interrupting] Dear sir, where have you [words indistinct], where have you got that from? Sir, you are pulling, you are pulling various components out of context.

[Rymanowski] The last issue of GAZETA WYBORCZA.

[Walesa] Sir, as regards GAZETA WYBORCZA, I wish to state once more: That interview was not authorized, and my friend, a friend whom I will never deny from the period of struggle, when he was excellent, did me a bad turn here because he came at me with a prepared and beautifully cleaned up interview, put it aside, and we just talked a little. Then he wrote up his interview in GAZETA WYBORCZA, beautifully cleaned up, and my dirty, uncleaned-up one was entered into that one. So he did a dishonest thing, and this caused many components, which found themselves there in the fervor of discussion and argumentation but would, on the other hand, never have found themselves published or in an authorized interview. For these were auxiliary components in the explanation of certain matters. That is why it was not permitted to publish them, and we agreed that there would be an authorization, and he did not keep his word.

[Rymanowski] Thank you very much Mr. President. Thank you for this interview in our studio. [passage omitted]

Daily Views Walesa's Changing Image

WS3010094095 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 27 Oct 95 p 6

[Article by Agnieszka Kublik: "Presidential Splits"]

[FBIS Translated Text] *Everyone, both his friends and his enemies, admit that Lech Walesa has been acting differently lately. Has he really changed or has he only put on another mask?*

As recently as last spring no one predicted that Lech Walesa would have a good chance for reelection. His ratings as president and his policies were rather poor. He topped the list of people whom we distrusted.

However, for a few weeks now Walesa's position as a presidential candidate has been steadily improving. Today he is second; only Aleksander Kwasniewski is higher than he is. Why?

Instead of an Axe—Normalcy

Five years ago Walesa won the elections because he ran with an axe in his hand. It was a symbol of destruction, dispute, battle, setting people at odds with one another. It was a harbinger of a war at the top. Walesa felt wonderful playing the role of the first destroyer in the Republic. He wrote this role himself and he acted it out in a unique way. The five years of his presidency have abounded in quarrels and wars. He offended just about everyone—not only his enemies, but also allies.

Today Walesa is stressing that the key word in his second term will be "normalcy"—stability at top positions of power, peaceful completion of the reforms, and respect for the law and democracy.

A Team Instead of a Robin Hood

Walesa himself called the current term a "Robin Hood-type presidency." Robin Hood is a brigand who obtained as much as he was able to get by force. It is a symbol of a leader who ignores his advisers and makes decisions by himself, even if they go against the majority.

Here is what Walesa is saying today: "I am a team player." This means that he intends to listen to his advisers. It also means a complete change in his style of operation: openness to compromise, making concessions to others, admission of a mistake, and, possibly, subordination to his aides. Over the last three weeks we have clearly seen that Walesa accepted the rules of "team playing."

Language of Compromise Rather Than Battle

Until recently Walesa did not choose his words when talking about his opponents. It was not the language of a statesman by any standards.

Until recently he referred to former Prime Minister Olszewski a "monkey with a razor." However, a week ago they publicly shook hands and Walesa said: "If I said too much, I am sorry."

Five years ago he said the following in an interview for the Spanish daily EL PAIS: "What are they saying about Mazowiecki? That he is the greatest democrat. One would have to be an outright idiot." At an election rally in October 1990 he said the following: "He (Mazowiecki—editor's note) will not even catch a fly, while one must catch thieves here"; "Mazowiecki has always been a poor politician, and he still is today." However, in an interview for our newspaper this month, he said: "No one has done as much as Mazowiecki."

A few weeks ago he said the following about Prime Minister Oleksy: "He lies like a dog." However, last Friday he said: "Now that I have had a talk with Oleksy, I look at him with less hatred."

In earlier times Walesa used words to offend and scold people, to cause quarrels, to wage disputes. They were an instrument of battle. Today Walesa's language is quieter, more balanced, and he is choosing his words more carefully. This new language will be used to reach agreements.

Demand for Peace at the Top]

Language can be a harbinger of a change in the style of governing. Have his advisers worked a miracle? Have they changed the politician-destroyer to a politician-stabilizer?

No, they have not. Walesa has used his famous political instinct; he has sensed the demand. He knows what kind of a leader the people want to have. "Now there is demand for peace at the top," says one of Walesa's ministers. "And the president will be playing with that in mind."

Wearing the mask of a politician-stabilizer, Walesa is quickly moving up all the rankings. This is what his popularity is based on: He has been able to change his image quickly and thoroughly.

Walesa is skilled in this; he has already worn the mask of the leading destabilizer in Poland (the period of the war at the top), decommunizer (when he was linked to the Center Accord), promoter of the "left leg" (when he proposed Wieslawa Ziolkowska as a candidate for the president of the Supreme Chamber of Control).

There is a poster depicting Walesa standing with legs apart and threatening with a tight fist. So is he, after all, a fighting politician? No, he is not! When he was asked about that poster at a news conference, Walesa shouted out: "If only I knew who did that to me!"

A New, Better Image

Walesa is in a privileged position in this campaign simply because he is president. It was quite a good idea to hold a series of news conferences summing up his five-year term. With relatively minimal effort, he managed to sell to the media all the achievements of Walesa the statesman. It is already known what—good and bad things—Walesa is able to do. For this reason this year's campaign slogan is so popular: "There are many candidates, but there is the only one Lech Walesa."

His campaign staff have planned the campaign craftily. Walesa started to visit Polish towns later than the other candidates, when their campaign had already lost momentum. Now, he is visiting one town after another, one voivodship after another. All of his meetings are held early, so that the main [television] "Wiadomosci" newscast can report them on the same day. The effects are visible: Walesa is the person to whom information programs devote the most attention. His new image is being reinforced.

The problem is, what is he really like? Walesa is a champion of contradiction: He talks about normalcy while at the same time announcing that he will rule with decrees. Thus, I still do not know what the president's view of "normalcy" is.

Walesa Accused of Ties to SB, Embezzlement

WS3010120195 Warsaw TRYBUNA in Polish 27 Oct 95 pp 1, 3

["Text" of letter by Anna Walentynowicz, prominent Solidarity activist in the 1980's, to Polish President Lech Walesa in Gdansk on 25 September 1995: "Do You Really Have No Fear of God, Lech?!"]

[FBIS Translated Text] *The past is being distorted and manipulated under our eyes. To save the truth, someone* *has to ask about facts, while the witnesses are still alive. The years of joint work oblige me to ask Lech Walesa, candidate for the office of Polish president, several questions.*

I hereby declare that I assume full responsibility for these questions and their implications. I want to prove the truth in a court of law.

1. Do you remember that, in January 1971, you admitted that, at the request of the SB [Security Service], you had identified participants in the December events from photocopies and films. Can you now provide the reason behind this?

2. Why did you deceive everybody by saying you jumped over the fence, while during the 14 August 1980 strike you were transported from the Navy Headquarters in Gdynia on a motorboat?

3. How did you reconcile your Catholic morality with the open affairs, for which your wife publicly chided you in 1980?

4. On 9 December 1980, Solidarity received its first award—$30,000. What did you do with this money?

5. What have you done with the $60,000 award from the Swedish press, which you were to donate to the renovation of the "Landscape of Raclawice" [a famous painting], though you have never done so?

6. Did you buy the apartment at 52 Polanki Street, or did you receive it as a gift, and from whom?

7. How much money did Bagsik [businessmen accused of large-scale embezzlement] and other businessmen contribute to your first election campaign?

8. Do you consider it appropriate that a state leader deposits money in foreign banks, which contradicts Polish law?

9. Did the Interfactory Founding Committee [successor to "Solidarity strike committees"] Presidium inform you in 1980 that M. Wachowski [former Walesa aide] was an SB captain?

10. Does Wachowski have your pictures from joint orgies, and was this the reason why you did not react to his actions?

11. Did the SB blackmail you with disclosing certain facts about opening criminal proceedings for thefts at a juvenile court and a district court, thus demanding full cooperation?

12. For what merits were you granted the right to hunt with [former Interior Minister] General Kiszczak and spend five weeks with your family in the Arlamowo [internment camp], while other prisoners were denied the right to ordinary meetings?

13. Do you remember your statement made at the U.S. Congress: "Invest your capital in Poland, because one can reap the best profits on poverty and stupidity?" Do you still think so?

14. Which election promise have you kept?

15. Are you now able to answer the following question asked by A. Gwiazda [Solidarity activist in the 1980's] at the First Congress of Solidarity—how can two Poles come to terms, if one of them is a traitor?

16. When will you fulfill your public promise to account for your property, and reveal its real sources, since "your books" have lost money? When will you fulfill your promise to explain your relations with the SB?

17. Has there not been enough of your lies, shuffling, incompetence, and greed? Do you really have no fear of God, Lech?

[Signed] Anna Walentynowicz

Gdansk 25 September 1995

* * *

Editorial Note

We received Anna Walentynowicz's letter a few weeks ago. During a telephone conversation, the author confirmed its authenticity. Therefore, we published only a report on the letter, avoiding its most drastic portions. Meanwhile, the letter has been published by other magazines (such as PRZEGLAD TYGODNIOWY and NOWE SKANDALE). Still, it is TRYBUNA that the president is constantly accusing of publishing the letter. On Thursday, he did so on the Polish Radio First Program. Our readers are asking what is going on. In this regard, we feel forced by Lech Walesa to publish the text of the letter, so that our readers and radio listeners know what the president is talking about when accusing TRYBUNA.

Growing Support for Walesa Assessed

WS2710133095 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 26 Oct 95 p 3

[Article by Malgorzata Subotic: "Walesa's Force of Attraction"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Presidential candidates, at least those who have Solidarity roots, are encouraging a joint "crusade" against Lech Walesa. Meanwhile, their political bases are beginning to look in the direction of the incumbent president with increasing respect. Once again Walesa is proving his force of attraction, a force which commands respect but which does not necessarily arouse warm feelings in the world of politics. Why was and why is Lech Walesa still a problem for Polish political parties?

Two weeks before the elections, public opinion polls show that Walesa's chances of success are increasing. If this trend continues, he will be the rival of Aleksander Kwasniewski in the second round. The rest of the 17 candidates have apparently unanimously decided to attack the two. It should be added, however, that as the election date draws closer, attacks on Walesa are becoming increasingly intense.

Anyone but Walesa

Pretenders for the presidential office (this particularly goes for politicians with a Solidarity record) are readily warning that a choice between Kwasniewski and Walesa is in fact no choice. The first to start talking about this "no-alternative alternative" was Freedom Union [UW] candidate Jacek Kuron: "This is a choice between evil and evil. No matter what the result is, it will bring about chaos and confusion. I will endorse any candidate but not Lech Walesa."

A few days later Kuron was joined by Lech Kaczynski and Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz. They announced that they would hold talks the purpose of which would be to appoint a joint candidate. Kuron proposed a "platform agreement." Gronkiewicz-Waltz revealed that negotiations were under way "with several rightist candidates." The purpose of those negotiations would be to persuade those candidates to throw their support to her. Lech Kaczynski, Marek Markiewicz, and Janusz Korwin-Mikke also have declared that they are prepared for talks on backing out of the race. The group of potential participants of such negotiations includes Jan Olszewski and Leszek Moczulski.

However, as far as the leader of the Confederation for an Independent Poland [Moczulski] is concerned, next Sunday he will most probably throw his support behind Walesa. This is at least suggested by pieces of information that are coming from the competing election staffs.

In fact, however, all these announcements of agreements and negotiations seem to be a play for appearances sake, and perhaps a play of illusionary hopes. None of the candidates whose support is not greater than the statistical error in opinion polls (that is, between 2 and 3 percent) is showing any signs of resignation. Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz is openly speaking about the intention of taking over the voters of other candidates. Kuron's proposal, in turn, sounds pretty vague. What kind of a "platform agreement" can Kuron, Olszewski, Gronkiewicz, Kaczynski, and Korwin-Mikke reach over just a few days? Perhaps it would be an agreement on such issues as decommunization, church-state relations, social guarantees for citizens, etc.?

Tadeusz Zielinski, a candidate whose platform is the closest to Kuron's, is adamant and says that he will not back out, and even in the second round he would not throw his support to any candidate.

Illusory Hopes

Of course, it cannot be ruled out that candidates with support that does not exceed 1 percent will finally withdraw. After all, it is better to back out now than to find on election day that the electorate of the candidate consists of his relatives and close acquaintances.

The thing is, however, that withdrawal of such candidates is not likely to change anything in the race—even if we make the oversimplified assumption that all the potential voters act on the suggestion made by their withdrawing favorite. Support not greater than a percentage fraction will be insignificant in this game. Why try to reach an agreement, then?

The purpose of it all is to "chase the rabbit rather than catch it," that is, to bring about a social effect. By saying over and over again that the choice between Kwasniewski and Walesa is evil, we may encourage voters to find a golden means, a third candidate. In the voters' eyes, this "third" candidate might be any of those listed before. At least there is a shadow of a chance for that.

Thanks to such tactics adopted by the remaining candidates, Democratic Left Alliance [SLD] leader Aleksander Kwasniewski can feel safe. Attacks on him are becoming increasingly weaker because in the first round he is "beyond competition" anyway. He has got his ticket for the next game in his hand already. Walesa, however, is certainly a problem for them, regardless of the anticommunist rhetoric which they use in their speeches. Those UW members who tend to express rather ironic opinions even claim that Kuron has taken advantage of the idea of the Three-Fourth Initiative, but has excluded the incumbent president from it.

Seeking the Group of the Winner

In the meantime, there are "increasingly more differences" in the behavior of political parties and the behavior of the candidates supported by them. Such behavior can be called both a manifestation of political pragmatism (it is a chance to achieve their political goals) and ordinary opportunism. At any rate, the intention is the same: to join the group of the winner. For ideological reasons, acceptance of Kwasniewski is totally out of the question. Of course, Walesa may lose to the SLD leader, but even in such an event, which is the darkest scenario for the Solidarity camp, he will remain the strongest link of the anticommunist camp.

The effects of Walesa's force of attraction have recently been most noticeable in the Christian-National Union [ZChN]. Ryszard Czarnecki's party first enthusiastically supported Gronkiewicz-Waltz and now it is coming over to Walesa's camp. It looks like next weekend the formal decision will be made. Since the beginning of the campaign there has been a group of people in ZChN who never got over the fact that their party decided to endorse the president of the National Bank of Poland [NBP]. When the ratings of Ms. Gronkiewicz-Waltz began to slump and the ratings of the incumbent president started to climb, the group launched an attack on Chairman Czarnecki—an attack for supporting a bad candidate. They announced that they would call certain people to account for their activities. Czarnecki's response was immediate: "The candidacy of Hanna Gronkiewicz-Waltz was excellent, but it was a few months ago." According to the ZChN chairman, this act of disloyalty was a "political reaction to reality." Here is how ZChN activists explain the change of heart off the record: "Whoever lives by the sword dies by the sword," and they recall the disloyalty of the NBP president to her promoter Walesa. It should be added, however, that in the eyes of voters the fact that ZChN is abandoning Gronkiewicz-Waltz does not necessarily have to be detrimental to her candidacy.

Tusk Gave Up His Place in UW Leadership

The "troubles with Walesa" are only beginning in the UW, the biggest opposition party. The statement by Kuron, who publicly hinted last week that he would not vote for Walesa in the second round, caused controversy and the first conflicts within UW.

Soon after that, at the "Breakfast in Radio Zet" program, Andrzej Celinski (a supporter of Kuron in UW) said that "Kuron let it slip." He said that his party's stand on Walesa involved "painful criticism, like in a family." The decision as to how the UW should act in the second round of the elections will be made two days after the first round by the party's council, that is, by its broad (over 100 people) leadership.

However, first conflicts over this issue can be seen already. Donald Tusk (former chairman of the Liberal-Democratic Congress—KLD) demanded at a session of the UW presidium last Tuesday that the party leadership disassociate themselves from that statement by Kuron. However, he was not supported by others. As a sign of protest he tendered his resignation from office in the highest leadership (presidium). The possibility cannot be ruled out that others will follow suit. Despite the decisions made at the congress in April, representatives of the rightist-liberal wing (such as, apart from Tusk, Jan Maria Rokita, Bronislaw Komorowski, and Janusz Lewandowski) remained in the UW presidium.

After the first round, the council will make the final decisions and, possibly, find people responsible for mistakes made in the campaign.

However, most people in the UW tend to believe that the party will endorse the incumbent president if he competes with Kwasniewski in the second round. Fairly few unionists agree with Waldemar Kuczynski, who says that before the second round of the elections the party might not point to any candidate or that it might not encourage its supporters to go to the polls.

What is the problem, then? First, UW candidate Jacek Kuron said what he said and it will be difficult for him to eat his words. Second, and most probably more importantly, support for Walesa does not put an end to the "problem of Walesa" in the UW.

"Between the election rounds Lech Walesa will probably try to recreate the Solidarity camp. Reaching an agreement on substantive matters is difficult, but recreation of the unity myth is certainly possible," says Wojciech Arkuszewski of UW.

End of the Robin Hood Era

Indeed, the president has already tested such an option—two years ago, before the parliamentary elections in 1993. At that time, when the Suchocka government was recalled on the motion of Solidarity ("S"), he suggested establishing "a camp of reforms" which would consist of the groupings which made up that cabinet. It would be established under Walesa's patronage. It would be an election bloc which might successfully compete with the SLD on 19 September. The offer was turned down almost immediately. It is worth recalling that the coalition of the Suchocka government was made up of the following parties: the Democratic Union, the Polish Economic Program, and KLD (currently UW), ZChN, the Party of Christian Democrats, the Conservative Party, the Peasant-Christian Party, the Peasant Accord (which split with the coalition later on), "S" (the trade union supported the cabinet at the beginning).

If people are to draw conclusions and learn lessons from history, we may expect that this idea will reappear, with the president acting as the "patron." This is because Lech Walesa, if he defeats Kwasniewski, is not likely to set up a presidential party. Solidarity politicians mostly agree about that. However, he is going to look for new people to form his political base. So far he has only minimally used UW politicians for that purpose. (Only the liberals are experienced in that). According to unofficial information, in the second term this is to be changed.

Walesa has already announced the "end of a Robin Hood-type presidency." "Robin Hood is a president without a [political] base—he is himself strong, wise. Now it is necessary to seek agreement with parties," he explained in one of his recent interviews.

Even though they are feeling increasingly more attracted by Walesa, leaders of post-Solidarity groupings are still distrustful of him. This is, in fact, no wonder because a few days ago he admitted, with disarming frankness, that "I only keep racking my brains" and "I will think about friends when I retire."

Various parties, first of all the UW, will in future weeks be involved in internal disputes over exactly these two issues: being part of Walesa's presidential base, and assumption (or not) of the role of the patron in the Solidarity election bloc.

Kwasniewski on Political Beliefs, Campaign

LD2710143795 Warsaw Radio Zet Network in Polish 0715 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Announcer Krzysztof Skowronski] Today's guest of Radio Zet is Aleksander Kwasniewski, leader of the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic [SdRP] and Democratic Left Alliance [SLD] and presidential candidate of the left. Good morning.

[Kwasniewski] Good morning.

[Skowronski] Have you become accustomed to the fact that you are going to face Lech Walesa in the second round of the elections?

[Kwasniewski] Not only have I gotten used to it, but also I was sure about it from the start. I think this is a certain paradox, that many friends of Lech Walesa lost hope in Lech Walesa, while I was convinced that he would be in the second round.

[Skowronski] Do you see him as a convenient rival?

[Kwasniewski] I think he is a very difficult rival for anyone, and the situation in the center right shows today that one should not underestimate Lech Walesa. He is a politician rooted quite firmly in Poles' minds, he is a symbol, he is the president, which always creates possibilities for extra influence. In addition, he has talent with regard to many issues, which many candidates of the right do not have.

[Skowronski] What kind of talent?

[Kwasniewski] Surely for communicating with a certain part of the nation, surely a certain political dynamism and uncompromising attitude.

[Skowronski] Do you expect any surprises during these elections, or is it Aleksander Kwasniewski and Lech Walesa in the second round?

[Kwasniewski] I think there still may be some surprises, and one has to approach all polls and mock elections with a certain distance. I do not overestimate these results, but I also do not underestimate them. In my view, the Polish public has matured during the past five years, and poll results today are much closer to reality because there is no reason to hide one's political sympathy. Taking all of these points into consideration, I think that any change in the present indications should be treated as a surprise. However, as regards the number of votes particular candidates are going to get, I think there exists a considerable amount of scope for surprises.

[Skowronski] What is going to decide who will be president? A television debate like in the United States and France?

[Kwasniewski] Yes, to a considerable extent.

[Skowronski] Are you prepared for such a debate?

[Kwasniewski] Well, I think one cannot prepare oneself in one day. Candidates work on it for years.

[Skowronski] Have you been working for years to get ready for the debate?

[Kwasniewski] In a sense yes, because one gathers political experiences, knowledge, and views on certain issues for years. One cannot work out a view on European security or the European Union just for the debate. It would then become just a well-learned lesson.

[Skowronski] Do you believe you will win the elections?

[Kwasniewski] Yes, I do.

[Skowronski] On what ground?

[Kwasniewski] Well, I may say that there are many reasons to support my conviction. I believe that what I have to offer and what I present at numerous meetings with the electorate appeals to a large group, much larger than the so-called traditional electorate. There are many young people and women at these meetings. [passage omitted]

[Skowronski] Why do you want to become the president of Poland?

[Kwasniewski] Because I think that a proposal I have for Poland is good and right for the present moment and for the years 1995-2000. I think there is no need for a permanent revolution in Poland, that the choice made in 1989 was the right one for Poland—to be a democratic, free-market, European country, inscribed in the European structures. What requires changes today is the departure from a symbolic period to a pragmatic one. I would like to give the necessary impulse to all issues, to the effect that everything is more permanent and stable and there is more normalcy.

[Skowronski] Do you think you guarantee the departure from this symbolic period? You have been identified with a certain organization, a certain political group.

[Kwasniewski] If I am elected, it is going to be important also from the viewpoint of breaking this stereotype. [passage omitted]. When I talk to people I feel that they want to see a man who is able to give Poland a constitution, to organize work to make a constitution possible, who wants to maintain economic growth, while at the same time wanting to resolve the difficult social problems, who will lead Poland into the European structures, who simply will be more practical with less declarations and more efficient actions.

[Skowronski] What do you mean by practical and efficient?

[Kwasniewski] That the issues are dealt with. When assessing the last five years of the presidency, one can clearly see that many slogans have remained just slogans. [passage omitted]

[Skowronski] What kind of president do you want to be? A strong one or one who represents only Poland?

[Kwasniewski] Neither. I think we have clear constitutional rules in Poland that say that a Polish president is not as powerful as the U.S. President but not as weak as the president of Germany. The Polish president holds important instruments to influence the legislative processes and government decisions, and he should use these opportunities. Generally, I see the Polish president not as a critic of events around him, which has been Lech Walesa's attitude, but as a person who participates in order to ensure the best possible effect of work on important issues. I think I am going to use the right to veto less, and I am not going to wait for a mistake by government or a minister of parliament, but participate in legislative work and cooperate with everybody who accepts this policy.

[Skowronski] What do you mean by everybody?

[Kwasniewski] Everybody, including the parliamentary opposition. [passage omitted

[Skowronski] Let us consider the option in which you are defeated by Lech Walesa. What will happen then?

[Kwasniewski] I will congratulate the president, I will wish him luck, and I will remain the leader of the largest parliamentary faction. [passage omitted]

[Skowronski] How much is your election campaign costing?

[Kwasniewski] I do not know. A treasurer has everything under control.

[Skowronski] One of the candidates maintains that the figure is approximately 100 billion zlotys.

[Kwasniewski] Nonsense. I do not think anybody taking part in the campaign can afford that.

[Skowronski] If the treasurer controls things, how do you know that it is not 100 billion?

[Kwasniewski] Because I know what figure we expected and how much we would be able to collect. I said clearly that we were going to spend as much as we got, without loans. [passage omitted]

[Skowronski] Thank you, and let me remind our listeners that we were talking to Aleksander Kwasniewski.

Walesa Might Mount 'Barricade' If Kwasniewski Wins

LD2710175595 Warsaw Polskie Radio First Program Network in Polish 1700 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] In an interview for Radio Lodz, President Lech Walesa said that, if there is social unrest after Aleksander Kwasniewski's election victory, he would not, as he put it, set one Pole against another, but he might mount a barricade.

President Walesa said that if he is reelected and the parliament is legally dissolved, the most suitable candidate for prime minister would be Andrzej Olechowski.

Duma Official Wants Delay in NATO Membership

WS2710154095 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 27 Oct 95 p 2

[Article by "KRZEM": "Representative of the Russian Duma on Poland and NATO; We Are Not Threatening You, but..."]

[FBIS Translated Text] *Vladimir Lukin, chairman of the Russian Duma Foreign Affairs Commission, asked Polish politicians yesterday to put off joining NATO and to enter a dialogue with Russia on the issue without any preconditions.*

Lukin came to Poland at the invitation of the Sejm Foreign Affairs Commission. He answered the deputies' questions for an hour and a half. He then met with Polish politicians and experts at the euro-atlantic association. Lukin is one of the most influential Russian politicians, a leader of the opposition group Yabloko (Yavlinskiy-Boldyrev-Lukin).

"I am for a debate on NATO, but without any preliminary conditions. We have time," argued Lukin. "Nobody poses a threat to Poland, even if Zhirinovskiy comes to power. We had better think about this together, because a lack of a decision is far better than a very bad decision."

He said that he would enter the dialogue in the belief that "we will not threaten anyone or tell them they do not have a right of veto." "When they say Russia has no right to veto the acceptance of new states into NATO, it is a banal truth," Lukin explained. "Only NATO members have a right to accept new members. From the political point of view, however, this is absurd because it means that no matter what we say, you will do what you want anyway."

"This way you are absolving Russia," Lukin went on, "of the obligation to respect your opinion." He added: "Although our potential is not what it used to be in the past, it does exist. Whenever we say that, you reply that Russia is threatening you. But we are not threatening you. We just want to explain why we feel uncomfortable. And we are inviting you to a dialogue."

Lukin gave Finland and Sweden as an example—countries lying close to the Russian borders, EU members that gave up their membership in NATO.

He said he sees the NATO expansion plans as a betrayal of Russian democrats. He also stated that all the political forces in Russia are against the enlargement of NATO. "Why? Because Russia has weakened, her Armed Forces have been reduced several times and the military budget is lean. And now, NATO, the largest military machine in the world, is nearing her borders. What reason do we have to claim that NATO does not pose any threat to us? Because it is administered by good guys? What if bad guys come to power in Germany or the United States?" asked Lukin.

"What if Poland was accepted into NATO and neither nuclear arms nor NATO forces were deployed on her territory?" asked Tadeusz Iwinski of the Democratic Left Alliance. "Then it might be the start of a dialogue," Lukin replied. "Experts will decide what Poland's membership in NATO is to consist of and what that will mean for Russia."

Oleksey, Duma Member Discuss Ties, European Issues

LD2710161895 Warsaw PAP in Polish 1139 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Warsaw, 27 Oct (PAP)—Polish-Russian bilateral relations and the future system of European security were the main topics of today's meeting between Prime Minister Jozef Oleksy and Vladimir Lukin, chairman of the International Affairs Committee of the Russian Duma.

"As far as issues of European security are concerned, divergence of opinion remains and there is room for further discussion. It is not a question who is right, but there is a need to understand one simple thing: that the issues of European security and bilateral relations are far more important in the longer perspective than divergence on some concrete matters," Lukin said after the meeting.

A regular and extensive dialogue should be carried out between Russia and Poland, which is the central point of Russian policy in East Europe; on the Polish side there is a tendency at present to communicate with Russia through intermediaries located on the other side of the political map, he said. Lukin announced that it was agreed that both sides will be involved in arranging such a dialogue at government and interparliamentary levels and also by independent experts. I think that we shall be able to find an option for healthy cooperation, Lukin said.

Cabinet Adopts 1996 Budget; Oleksy Comments

LD2710232095 Warsaw Third Program Radio Network in Polish 2000 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] The government has adopted next year's budget, in which an approximately 90 billion old zloty deficit is assumed. Nonetheless, as Prime Minister Oleksy announced, several of the government's priority sectors have received additional funds. The prime minister mentioned, among other things, 3,500 additional full-time posts for the police and 500 for the judicial police to be set up next year; additional sums for scientific research into the development of rural areas, including primarily for roads in the eastern provinces. The head of government had this to say about the reasons for the long-drawn-out discussion of the state's finances:

[Begin Oleksy recording] I did not foresee that certain overall figures, which were discussed together with the budget assumptions, would return. Evidently their specific force is such that some matters have to be discussed over again, but the structure of the budget is not and will not be questioned. The proportions will be maintained. I will say that everything is going with a certain satisfaction with this budget structure, for in 1996, increases in all items have been noted for the first time. A drop has been achieved in the share of the costs of servicing the public debt in relation to budget outlays. Those are the directional trends which, I say, tell us to discuss the accompanying aspects calmly. [end recording]

Military To Get More Money

LD3010100695 Warsaw Polskie Radio First Program Network in Polish 0900 GMT 30 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Deputy Prime Minister [and Finance Minister] Grzegorz Kolodko has said that next year's draft budget assumes an increase in real expenditure on the Armed Forces of 4.3 percent in relation to this year's figure. It has been constructed in such a way as to check the increase in subsidies to the ineffective social insurance system and in expenditure on servicing the public debt.

In the deputy prime minister's opinion, thanks to this, an 8-percent increase in expenditure on education and a 14-percent increase on higher education has turned out to be possible. Expenditure on the police, the security services, and the administration of justice will also increase by 8-9 percent.

The draft budget, Grzegorz Kolodko said, also envisages a significant increase in expenditure on the restructuring of rural areas.

Defense Minister on Media Coverage of Army

WS2710124095 Warsaw POLSKA ZBROJNA in Polish 25 Oct 95 pp 1, 3

[Article by Defense Minister Zbigniew Wojciech Okonski: "Arguments Instead of Slogans"]

[FBIS Translated Text] *Problems pertaining to state defense have never been easy. And they never will be. This provides all the more reason to appreciate a new phenomenon that has appeared this year with particular force. I have in mind the profound, albeit, sometimes overly animated, debate on issues pertaining to the Army and defense. It began during a Sejm debate last February and was repeatedly taken up at cabinet sessions. The media have practically never stopped taking part in it.*

It is understandable that the debate has entered a more poignant phase over the course of the presidential campaign. One must not forget, however, that all considerations must be devoid of emotions and judgmental statements, even if they are to serve the sole purpose of articulating a thesis or thought more explicitly. The problems that have recently been taken up by the press unquestionably belong to the most important of the overall defense issues. The ongoing presidential campaign is a good moment to take up these issues, considering the president is the chief commander of the Armed Forces. This is also the right time to make the citizens and their political representatives aware of how many problems pertaining to state defense and security need to be solved. Unfortunately, at this very heated time many facts are misinterpreted and numerous statements that are only seemingly true are issued.

Responsibility Is an Obligation and a Privilege

Our country still does not have a Constitution, the document that regulates the key issues of state defense. There is thus no general guideline for building a new state structure and, as a consequence, there is no clear-cut, precise definition of the role and place of the Armed Forces in the state, the authority and responsibility of the particular state organs for the security of Poland.

The fact that Poland is still in the process of developing a democratic system requires a special approach on the part of public figures to crucial state issues, an understanding of the complexity of the situation, farsightedness, and prudence in forming opinions. Political circumstances demand the same of the media, which should not only inform the citizens about the most important problems of the nation and the state, as they are also partly responsible for the consequences of the opinions they formulate. In each democracy the media play a similar role and, I hope, they are aspiring the same in Poland. Upon closer inspection of some publications, it becomes visible that our media are still far from realizing the fact that responsibility is an attribute not only of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, but of the media—the 'fourth' power—as well. Responsibility is an obligation as well as a privilege.

It is difficult to overcome the impression than the popularization of negative statements and even creating certain theories may be detrimental to the image projected by the Armed Forces in our country. Endless attacks on the Army, questions about its merit, doubts as to the qualifications—also moral—of the commanding officers, and the search for hidden meaning in issues which by their very nature do not invite any discussion provoke reaction. I do not claim that servicemen should be encouraged to speak in public. Under the current circumstances, however, one may hardly be surprised that servicemen are trying to voice their opinions, as General Tadeusz Wilecki [chief of General Staff] did in RZECZPOSPOLITA, especially as even some of the politicians themselves find it difficult to realize how important the problems faced by the Army are.

Many important—perhaps obvious—issues have been omitted in the ongoing debate. The condition of our defense, and thus, the security of the state is a function of the financial condition of the country, the system, actions taken by the government, and all of the structures within the Ministry of National Defense [MON]. The continual changing of governments and systematic decrease of funds allocated to defense do not facilitate the implementation of mandatory responsibilities of the ministry in which I head. Despite the difficulties, despite the cuts, our Armed Forces, contrary to popular opinion, continue to retain high combat readiness.

The fact has also been overlooked that basic documents expounding our defense doctrine remain unamended and effective. The clearly specified provisions of this doctrine, coupled with determination and consistency in their implementation, give grounds to claim that any speculations about it and innuendos as to our intentions—in particular, in cooperation with NATO and neighboring states—are completely unsubstantiated.

At this point, I need to state that allegations which claim General Wilecki's political ambitions "impair" our integration with NATO are not based on any facts and are totally absurd. The general himself was astonished to learn that he alone "pulls all the strings" in the process of integrating Poland with the Western security system.

Looking at the whole issue from a different vantage point than the one chosen by the author of a catchy article carried by GAZETA WYBORCZA under the title "Hat Under the Four-Cornered Cap," one must note that many factors influence our relations with the North Atlantic Treaty, from the situation on the international political scene to the actual achievements of the Polish side. MON performs its duties in both the general and the particular spheres. The General Staff of the Polish Armed Forces guarantees the direct implementation of the Partnership for Peace program, as well as bilateral military cooperation on the tactical level. And it is doing this very well.

At this point I have to remind that Western analysts and experts very highly assessed the first international "Cooperation Bridge" exercises organized by the Polish Armed Forces at the testing grounds in Biedrusko last year. We received similar marks for the "Double Eagle" exercises and for the performance of our servicemen during exercises held in Louisiana. I have personally heard many words of praise from U.S. Defense Secretary William Perry, General John Shalikashvili, and German Defense Minister Volker Ruehe, who were not simply being polite and strongly emphasized our leading role in the implementation of the Partnership for Peace program.

Civilian Control Over the Armed Forces

The recently raised issue of civilian and democratic control over the Armed Forces is undoubtedly a very complex problem, requiring a very analytical approach. Claims are constantly being raised that such control is lacking, that the Army is gaining more independence and autonomy.

No one, however, has yet made the slightest attempt at explaining to the nation what "control" actually consists of, what the origins and meanings of this term are. The citizens of our country are not aware that this is more than a simple supervision of the military, that is, to put it simply, watching the commanding officers' hands. The term means ongoing administration, supervision and—most of all—responsibility. Not only political, but also what we might call "civilian." I mean responsibility for actions as well as for words and their consequences. Unfortunately, this is treated too lightly in Poland.

I do not find any arguments which would justify not saying that the principle of civilian control is realized in Poland in many areas, both by the legislative and executive powers. The president, the government, parliament, the civil rights spokesman and the Supreme Chamber of Control exercise their rights in this field. The current system of exercising civilian and democratic control over the Armed Forces raises many substantial doubts. I do have to stress very strongly, however, that this system is very effective in the executive power body I head. There indeed are certain ambiguities—in particular, regarding authority—above the level of defense minister. As head of the ministry, however, I am also trying to perform duties related to civilian control within the highest state institutions—the National Defense Committee, the Council of Ministers, and the Defense Committee of the Council of Ministers.

Our Own Model

In the midst of the heated debate it is often forgotten that Poland must define her own model of exerting civilian control within the provisions of the Constitution. It is impossible to import a universal model because it does not exist. Each of the Western states has its own system of exercising civilian and democratic control over the army, accounting for characteristic national features. When NATO was being established, no one defined the notion of "civilian control over the armed forces" because there simply was no such need. The principle was shaped in the effect of a long process of building democratic systems in the particular states. Now that NATO has laid down the conditions of accepting us as a member, it turns out that among longstanding members of the alliance, there also exist considerable differences in the way the problem is understood and implemented.

It is furthermore impossible to employ solutions applied during the Second Polish Republic. The political circumstances have changed, the perception of the role of civilian control is also no longer the same. The current system in Poland, perhaps not ideal, is still encumbered by the fact that the current law is antiquated. Yet it does exist. This has to be acknowledged at least as one of the post-1989 developments.

Legislative initiatives to construct a lucid and efficient system of exerting civilian and democratic control over the Armed Forces should be considered. Politicians of various persuasions who were in power over the last years could probably provide the fullest answer to that. The opinions of the politicians could perhaps be more credible and the media would see that issues of power have still not been settled. The 1967 Law on Universal Defense Obligation still remains effective. Even though it has been amended, it is outdated and does not meet modern standards. The Armed Forces have been waiting for years for over a dozen laws related to military issues to pass. Legal regulation of the functioning of the Armed Forces in a democratic environment is necessary. These laws are currently being developed.

In this context, one cannot fail to mention the MON budget, which is sometimes used for political bargaining. The lack of stability of Army finances does not allow one to project realistic strategic defense policies. Fortunately, I was successful in convincing the government to project expenditures on defense for the long term.

One cannot speak of the problems faced by the Army without posing the question of the consequences of one's words and their meaning. A profound discussion on key state defense issues should lead to more insightful reflections, formulated in consideration of the highest state interests.

I am always prepared to enter such a discussion.

Official Denies Sea, Land Corridors Linked

AU2710175295 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1430 GMT 27 Oct 95

[Report by Ilinka Todorovski from Zagreb]

[FBIS Translated Text] The news and speculations that the Slovene and the Croatian presidents discussed a sort of Croatian land corridor via Slovenia few days ago in New York are completely untrue, Dr. Zeljko Matic, foreign policy adviser to Croatian President Tudjman, who was present at the recent meeting of both presidents, confirmed for Slovene Radio. Matic also said that Presidents Kucan and Tudjman discussed the problem of the demarcation in Piran Bay, that is, the state border. The presidents discussed construction of the Slovene part of the Pyhrn highway from Macelj to Sentilj as a separate issue and, above all, without any sort of linking of one issue to the other.

The interlinking of these two issues is not entirely new to the Croatian public. For instance, the Croatian Council for Defense and National Security, which is a sort of supreme political and military body in Croatia and is led by President Tudjman himself, discussed this issue in June 1993. The stance of official Zagreb at the time, contained in a statement for the public, was: Croatia is wiling to acknowledge the Slovene interest in Piran Bay to the greatest possible extent and ensure the Slovene ships a liberal regime for sailing in the Croatian territorial waters. However, at the same time, it demands a similar flexibilty in the road transport from Zagreb to Sentilj.

Kucan Clarifies Statements on Croatian Corridor

AU2710175095 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1430 GMT 27 Oct 95

["Excerpt" from statement by Slovene President Milan Kucan on his talks with Croatian President Tudjman in New York on 23 October; in Ljubljana on 27 October—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Text] Within this context, we also discussed our relations, our interest that these relations develop well and in a friendly spirit as this befits two neighboring countries, and that we should resolve open issues. President Tudjman's position was that he saw no particular reasons for not solving the remaining open issues, that is, for not finding solutions for them. He said that he understood the Slovene interest in access to the open sea and that a compromise solution could be reached, of course, by simultaneously honoring the sovereignty of both countries. He also spoke about other, Croatian interests, namely, about Croatia's accession to the European integrations, the European Union, the Council of Europe, and so forth. Within this context, he also mentioned Croatia's well-known interest in road links to the West. What is crucial here is, of course, the road that links the north of Europe with the southeast, the so-called Pyhrn road, a part of which runs through Slovenia, namely from Sentilj to Macelj, that is, following the completion of the road to Maribor, from Maribor to Macelj. He did not mention any corridors in connection with this, as I understand the Slovene press is writing, but simply said that their interest was that Slovenia would include this road among the priorities in its road construction.

Italy To Suspend Talks Over Thaler's Statements

AU2710184695 Ljubljana MAG in Slovene 25 Oct 95 pp 20-21

[Report by Joze Biscak: "Levi's Diplomacy"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Italy will interrupt the negotiations with Slovenia because Slovene Foreign Minister Zoran Thaler, on his return from New York, gave untrue statements and misrepresented the facts about his talks with [Italian Foreign Minister] Agnelli by which he compromised her gravely. This is the unofficial information from the Italian Foreign Ministry that has been confirmed by a well-informed member of the Italian Senate foreign affairs commission.

The compromise proposal, the so-called non-paper statement that was allegedly formulated by Foreign Ministers Susanna Agnelli and Zoran Thaler in New York, by which the Italian side would be satisfied with 38 houses and Italy would then promise Slovenia to support it in its integrations with the European institutions, is a sort of replay of last year's episode with Lojze Peterle, who, because of the Aquileia statement, encountered the prime minister's criticism that he was selling off Slovene assets.

Operation of Persuasion

The New York adventure was followed by persuading the opposition and the public that this number of houses was a minimal sacrifice in comparison to the widely open doors to Europe. It is not really important who unearthed the phantom contents of the statement for the public—the Slovene or the Italian correpondents—the fact is that all this happed before the Italian side could take a stance toward it. In such crucial issues, this means a serious halt in the negotiations. [passage omitted]

"The government journalists" immediately accused the Italian side of not knowing what diplomacy was or wondered cynically whether this was a new program in international relations' studies, however, they evidently overlooked the fact that Zoran Thaler, with his statements, almost always makes sure that negotiations ground to a halt. With this, he unnecessarily complicates matters while professing that "Agnelli looks good in Levi 512s."

Soap Opera or Political Horror

The relations with Italy, which one of the Italian commentators compared to a soap opera, became a part of the internal political squabbles and electoral camping in Slovenia. For that reason, the government, at a closed session of the State Chamber commission for international relations, tried to place the responsibility for the failed foreign policy toward Italy on the deputies. The deputies, of course, resisted this and ordered it to draft a proposal of concrete solutions that will be substantiated and supported by data and analyses and that will be acceptable for our country. A solution was also proposed to the Foreign Ministry whereby the Slovene negotiators would link the return of the Esuli's [Italians who left Slovenia after 1954] real estate to the return of the real estate that the Italians seized from the Slovenes during the time of Fascism. [passage omitted]

Thaler's "Third World" Policy

Some Italian parties and their foreign affairs commission reached a conclusion that the Liberal Democracy of Slovenia was no longer a credible party and that they should thus wait for a new partner until the next elections or find him "elsewhere." We can only guess where this "elsewhere" is: The Christian Democrats or a hint to the Slovene prime minister to replace the foreign minister. The Italian Foreign Ministry concurs with this, lately describing Thaler's policy as a policy of "third world" countries. For Slovenia, which some say is a west European type of country (something completely new in the Italian vocabulary), this is inappropriate, to say the least.

Parliament Debates Annulment of Citizenships

AU2710175795 Ljubljana Radio Slovenia Network in Slovene 1430 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Although the extraordinary session of the State Chamber that is supposed to result in a proposal for the assessment of the constitutionality of a demand for the annulment of Article 40 of the Law on Citizenship is not over yet, it is already clear that the Slovene parliament will adopt this demand, as it was supported even by the initiators of the referendum. The only remaining question is whether the Constitutional Court will also take into account an opinion that the initiative constitutes unconstitutional material because its contents did not match with international agreements. This would allow the Constitutional Court to intervene before the 40,000 signatures for the calling of a referendum are actually gathered. Gojko Brvar reports:

[Begin recording] The State Chamber started the session armed with the opinion of its committee for internal policy and jurisdiction, which also supported the idea of investigating the constitutionality of the initiative and also recommended that the Constitutional Court should consider the possibility, due to the gross violation of human rights, of debating the matter before the 40,000 signatures are actually collected.

The deputies who took part in today's debate concurred that this was the initiative that could trigger intolerance on both sides and was, as such, dangerous, calling for the speediest possible ruling of the Constitutional Court. [passage omitted]

The legal ambiguities as to when the Constitutional Court should intervene also triggered a debate about the need to change the Law on Referendum and the Peoples' Initiative. Namely, the Slovene members of parliament have slowly come to realize that their rejection of an amendment that would allow the Constitutional Court to assess the constitutionality of an initiative in its initial phase was too hasty. They are supposed to amend this shortcoming in the future by changing the law. [end recording]

Federal

Government Endorses Strategy for Peace Talks

LD2710140495 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1217 GMT 27 Oct 95

[FBIS Translated Text] Belgrade, 27 October (TANJUG)—The federal government, in a session chaired by Prime Minister Radoje Kontic, endorsed participation in the peace negotiations to be held in Dayton, Ohio on 1 November, according to the Federal Secretariat for Information.

As part of the federal government's 14 September decision, the delegation will be represented by Slobodan Milosevic, president of the Republic of Serbia, Momir Bulatovic, president of the Republic of Montenegro, and Milan Milutinovic, Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The Serb Republic's delegation will be represented by Momcilo Krajisnik, president [speaker] of the assembly of the Serb Republic, Nikola Koljevic, vice president of the Serb Republic, and Aleksa Buha, minister for foreign affairs of the Serb Republic.

The federal government expects the Dayton conference to take a decisive step towards signing a peace agreement; ending the civil war in the former Bosnia-Herzegovina; and beginning a period of peace and recovery.

The Yugoslav delegation advocates these goals and will work toward them in the framework of the peace process. The federal government believes and rightly expects that the negotiations in Dayton will be followed by an end to the UN Security Council's sanctions against the FRY. Yugoslavia will then be an equal partner and fully contribute, together with the other participants, toward peace in this area.

Such expectations is based on the fact that punishing the FRY with sanctions has been completely unjustified; on the fact that despite this, it has met all the conditions cited in relevant resolutions of the UN Security Council; and that it has been advocating a peaceful and just solution to the problem throughout the entire period of negotiations. All of this has already been acknowledged by a large number of distinguished politicians and statesmen as they stress that Yugoslavia is today an indispensable factor in the search for a peaceful solution and that it is contributing in a constructive way to this end.

The federal government has authorized the Yugoslav delegation to stress these facts at the negotiations in Dayton in the interest of achieving the strategic goal—to bring about a lasting and just peace, according to the Federal Secretariat for Information statement.

Status of International Forces in Bosnia Viewed

LD2910141595 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1346 GMT 29 Oct 95

[By Sinisa Ljepojevic]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] London, Oct. 29 (TANJUG)—The setting up of an international force for Bosnia seems to have raised more controversies than the peace process itself.

It is still unclear whether the deployment of the 60,000-strong force would mean some kind of occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and division of interest zones, or whether the foreign troops' chief task would be to enforce a peace agreement between the warring sides.

The official version is that the force will remain in Bosnia for just one year, but none of the British military analysts could confirm this.

The fact that the force will be composed of combat troops makes one wonder whether they will be coming to Bosnia to fight the local population, or to help them restore peace.

The West insists that NATO troops make up the nucleus of the force, but it has to leave room for Russian soldiers and troops from some eastern European countries that plan to join NATO in the future.

It will also have to address the wishes of some Islamic countries that wish to send their troops to Bosnia too.

Even the Western allies themselves face big problems, because many of them are unwilling to place their troops under U.S.-led NATO command.

French officers cannot be nominated for command posts in the Bosnia force because France is not a member of NATO's integrated military structure, while the 15,000 British troops in the Bosnia force will be under direct command of British generals, with NATO retaining the supreme coordination role, like in the Gulf War.

British military sources say that dilemmas about the command structure can be resolved, but that the main problem of deployment in Bosnia still remains unsolved.

London analysts believe that each national contingent will be given a specific section in which its troops would patrol peace.

In practice, this would create a situation resembling the ones in Germany and Austria after World War II, where the big powers had divided the terrritories into a series of 'occupational zones.'

As for the Bosnian Serb side, which will be represented in the peace talks by the Federal Republic of

Yugoslavia, it is unacceptable that foreign troops be granted a status of occupiers in Bosnia.

During his recent visit to London, Yugoslav Foreign Minister Milan Milutinovic ruled out the possibility of these troops defending the interests of their countries 'with the methods of war.'

Montenegro

Bulatovic Comments on Peace Talks in U.S.

AU2710185095 Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian 1604 GMT 27 Oct 95

[Report on news conference by Montenegrin President Momir Bulatovic in Podgorica on 27 October by Slavisa Djordjevic—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Djordjevic] At the exceptionally well-attended news conference, Montenegrin President Momir Bulatovic first spoke in the introductory part of his speech about the current course of the peace process and the upcoming talks in the United States, where representatives of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Serb Republic, Croatia, and the Government of Bosnia-Herzegovina, with the mediation of the representatives of the Contact Group and the United States should agree on the final aspects of the peace agreement that is expected to be signed in Paris.

[Begin Bulatovic recording] The crisis and war events on the territory of the previous Yugoslavia have resulted in horrific suffering and hardship of the population, extensive destruction of material and spiritual property, and regression of all the states and peoples in this region. In addition, we have been the witnesses of the prolonged inability of the international community to stop the processes that are obliviously increasingly endangering not only peace and stability in this region and Europe, but also causing global political disturbances.

It is difficult to enumerate all the unsuccessful peace conferences and the numerous peace mediators who have not succeeded with their declared intentions.

Nevertheless, the conference that will begin soon is essentially different from all the previous ones. It has the greatest chance of success, which is confirmed by the seriousness of the preparations, and the attitudes of the entire international community. In addition, the fatigue of the advocates and protagonists of the war options and the resolve of the most powerful countries in the world to develop a unified approach to the warring sides are visible.

Unfortunately, all this has happened after too many mistakes and unsuccessful moves have been made, but it is better now then later. A number of important issues should be solved and essential agreements reached at the U.S. military base in Dayton in Ohio, without the presence of the public, without time limits, and without the possibility of anyone setting ultimatums and issuing threats to leave the talks.

The conclusion of the peace process for the former Yugoslav Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina is important, but not the only aim. The peace agreement for Bosnia is also the precondition for solving all other issues. This is dictated by the need to stabilize and normalize the situation in the Balkans.

The public is aware that on the basis of the agreement of 29 August of this year, it has been agreed that the delegation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Serb Republic jointly appear at the peace talks on the former Bosnia-Herzegovina. The mechanism for making decisions has also been determined. This mechanism will prevent obstructions in decisionmaking. In the past, this was the reason for missing a number of advantages contained in the past peace initiatives and plans.

The continuation of the war that ensued has significantly changed the balance of military forces in the former Yugoslavia, caused an exodus of hundreds of thousands of civilians, and unnecessarily prolonged the sanctions to our country. It is well-known that during the period of culmination of political differences to the peace process, all relations with the Serb Republic were suspended, except for offering humanitarian aid.

Considering that the leadership of the Serb Republic was excluded from the negotiating process a long time ago, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had to intensify diplomatic activities. A special role in this has been given to Mr. Slobodan Milosevic, president of the Serb Republic, which is understandable in view of the fact and need that an essentially interethnic and interpersonal [medjuljudski] conflict can and should be dealt with at the national levels of the mother countries of the parties to the conflict.

In this, I see the main reason for the convening of the conference on the basis of the three plus five model. Five refers to the Contact Group consisting of the most powerful and the most interested world countries, and three refers to the Serbian, Croatian, and Muslim leaders. The leaderships of Montenegro and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have accepted this approach by the peace mediators and supported this initiative. I am convinced that, in addition, we have helped the peace process in many other concrete ways and strengthened our position in it.

However, this has not been met with understanding of a section of our opposition that has voiced its views, warning about the perilous position of the Montenegrin interests and the secondary nature of its role. The arguments used to support this loud and boisterous thesis do not appear to be exceedingly convincing.

When it comes to the peace agreement on Bosnia-Herzegovina, whose integral part is the settlement of the status of local Serbs and their young state, Montenegro does not have the right nor should it have an interest in crucially influencing every concrete decision. Of course, as a kind of a hostage to the events there, Montenegro is and should be included in the peace process, but as an interested party and not the party to the conflict. In this respect, I would like to remind you that Montenegro's participation in all previous peace conferences—at which, fortunately for us, we were not in the focus of attention, as we have preserved peace and tried to build a democratic and open society—has not given reason for similar dilemmas. Similarly, there is no place for such dilemmas with regard to the forthcoming conference either.

The composition of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia indicates the intention to acknowledge the existing realities in the international and our own circumstances, and to respect the constitutional system of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The reality is that the world is still not recognizing for our country the full international-legal status, and is, therefore, not communicating adequately with our federal authorities. On the other hand, it is also a reality that we who have created the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on the basis of the democratically expressed wish of its citizens have no more important interests than to represent it worthily and to contribute to its strengthening and its reputation.

Therefore, it is my honor to be in a position to completely, equally, and within my constitutional and political duties take part in the decisions that concern the rights that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will acquire and the obligations that it will undertake.

Open and contentious issues with the neighboring countries and the main conditions for mutual recognitions, which is one of the aims of the conference, will not be decided by the joint delegation with the representatives of the Serb Republic, but only the delegation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, according to our constitutional principles that guarantee the equality of the republics.

As part of the preparations for the peace conference, we have held a number of extensive and comprehensive exchanges of views. We have established joint stands on all open issues. I personally do not expect any problems within the joint delegation, especially not within the delegation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Exceptionally difficult negotiations are ahead of us. The opposing political options that have led to the civil war will not be easy to reconcile. This is why, despite the optimisms that have been expressed, there is also room for reservations regarding the sincerity of the peace promises and commitments by all sides.

The joint delegation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Serb Republic will travel with the firm intention of contributing to the success of the conference. We are aware of the gravity of the decisions that we will have to make and the seriousness of the moment that requires these decisions. We are also prepared to make compromises to find principled and lasting just solutions. We also expect the other two sides to come to the negotiating table with the same intentions, and that the international mediators, above all the hosts of the conference, the United States, ensure such an approach.

The results of the conference can be extremely great, and are therefore worth the efforts that should be invested. Everyone needs peace, economic progress, and the development of democratic institutions. Montenegro and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia should have the right of the equal member of the international community returned to them and have the sanctions lifted as an integral part of the overall result of the conference.

I appeal to all the political forces in our republic, especially our citizens, to support our genuine peace efforts and contribute as much as they can to the acceptance and the realization of the peace agreement for the territory of the previous Yugoslavia. [end recording] [passage omitted]

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 352
MERRIFIELD, VA.

This is a U.S. Government publication produced by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

FBIS collects, translates, disseminates, and analyzes foreign open-source information on behalf of the U.S. Government. Its publications may contain copyrighted material. ***Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.***

- Bracketed indicators before the first sentence of each item describe the way in which the material was processed by FBIS.
- Headlines and all bracketed explanatory notes are supplied by FBIS.
- Personal and place names are rendered in accordance with the decisions of the U.S. Board on Geographic Names as adapted by FBIS. Unverified names in radio and television material appear in parentheses and are spelled phonetically; words and phrases in parentheses preceded by a question mark are unclear in the original and deduced from context.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

U.S. Government Customers

For a list of FBIS products, to subscribe to an FBIS publication, or to indicate a change of address contact:

FBIS
P.O. Box 2604
Washington, DC 20013-2604
Telephone: (202) 338-6735
FAX: (703) 733-6042

Non-Government Customers

Subscriptions are available from the National Technical Information Service:

NTIS
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
Telephone: (703) 487-4630
FAX: (703) 321-8547

New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.